

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVI

MARCH, 1948

No. 3

THE FRENCH DECREE OF MARCH 29, 1880

Clarence A. Herbst

LOUISVILLE'S "BLOODY MONDAY"—AUGUST 6, 1855

Leonard Koester

DE CIVITATE DEI: AN ANALYSIS

Edmond J. Smyth

THE CYPRUS CONVENTION OF JUNE 4, 1878

Albert J. Loomie

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Saint Louis University

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

50 cents a copy

\$2.00 a Year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVI

MARCH, 1948

No. 3

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN

JASPER W. CROSS

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI

JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY

THOMAS P. NEILL

PAUL G. STEINBICKER

HERBERT WEINSCHL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE FRENCH DECREE OF MARCH 29, 1880	51
<i>Clarence A. Herbst</i>	
LOUISVILLE'S "BLOODY MONDAY"—AUGUST 6, 1855	53
<i>Leonard Koester</i>	
<i>De Civitate Dei: AN ANALYSIS</i>	55
<i>Edmond J. Smyth</i>	
THE CYPRUS CONVENTION OF JUNE 4, 1878	57
<i>Albert J. Loomie</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES	65

CONTRIBUTORS

CLARENCE A. HERBST, S.J., A.M., formerly instructor in history, Creighton University, currently holds an administrative post at the Jesuit house of studies, Saint Mary's College, Kansas. He has been a regular contributor to THE BULLETIN.

LEONARD KOESTER, Ph.D., is an associate professor of German, University of Louisville.

ALBERT J. LOOMIE, S.J., is completing work for his Master's degree at Fordham University and is also teaching at Fordham Preparatory School.

EDMOND J. SMYTH, S.J., Cand. Ph.D., is in his theological studies at Alma College, Alma, California. His graduate work was done at the University of Toronto.

The French Decree of March 29, 1880

Clarence A. Herbst, S. J.

Saint Mary's College

ON MARCH 15, 1879, M. Jules Ferry, Minister of Public Instruction and the Fine Arts, proposed to the Chamber of Deputies at Versailles an education bill. The bill as a whole was bad enough, but Article 7 outdid the rest. "No one," it read, "is permitted to direct a public or private institution, of whatever kind it may be, or to give instruction in it, if he belongs to an unauthorized congregation."¹ This article was aimed especially at the Jesuit secondary schools. The Chamber passed the bill as it stood, but the Senate, exactly one year later, while accepting the rest of the measure, rejected Article 7 by a vote of 148 to 129. The Deputies allowed the measure as amended but voted this "order of the day" of M. Devés: "The House, reposing confidence in the Government, and counting on its firmness in enforcing the laws, passes to the order of the day." The government, thus empowered to enforce the existing laws that dealt with unauthorized associations, issued on March 29 two decrees, one against the Jesuits, the other against other religious congregations of men and women. We shall deal here only with the former. The text is as follows:

Article 1.—A delay of three months, from the date of the present Decree, is accorded to the so-called aggregation or association of Jesus, to dissolve, pursuant to the above-named laws, and to evaluate the establishments it occupies over the territory of the Republic.

This delay will be prolonged to the 31st of August, 1880, for the establishments in which literary or scientific instruction is given by the association to the young.

Article 2.—The Minister of the Interior and of Worship, and the Keeper of the Seals, Minister of Justice, are charged—each in his own province—with the execution of the present decree, which shall be inserted in the *Bulletin des Lois*, and in the *Journal Officiel*.

Given at Paris, the 29th of March, 1880.

Jules Grévy
Ch. Lepère
Jules Cazot²

It was no new thing in France for the government to be at odds with the religious orders, and especially with the Jesuits. The many laws passed since 1790 listed in the long preamble to the decree just quoted abundantly show this. That the France of the Revolution should quarrel with religious instruction in the schools

is no wonder when one recalls the naturalistic philosophy behind the Revolution and names like Rousseau and Voltaire.

Let us review the existing laws invoked to justify the decree. The first one is of February 19, 1790, and states: "The Constitutional Law of the kingdom shall no longer recognize solemn monastic vows of persons of either sex; consequently the regular orders and congregations in which such vows are taken, are, and remain, abolished in France, so that similar ones cannot in future be established." This law had caused the Society of Jesus trouble before, but when it was invoked against the members during the reign of Louis Philippe, a famous Consultation was rendered by M. Vatimesnil, M. Berthaud, and many other eminent jurists to the effect that the Law of 1790 meant to withdraw from the congregations the right of corporate existence and legal recognition of religious vows, but did not, however, withdraw from a French citizen the right to become and live as a Religious if he liked.³

The law of August 18, 1792 is: "The Archbishops and Bishops may, with the sanction of the Government, establish cathedral chapters and seminaries in their dioceses: all other ecclesiastical establishments are abolished." When one recalls that this "law" was passed in the fervid days between the famous August 10 and the September Massacres when Danton was in control, one can appreciate what kind of legislation it was. Neither was it signed by the King, as it had to be according to the Constitution before it had the force of law. Moreover, the courts considered it as having fallen into desuetude, and held that the penalties to be inflicted for its violation could not be applied. And the law had been abolished by the Charter of 1830.⁴ The decrees issued by Napoleon between the end of 1799 and 1804 were the mandates of a dictator and did not have the force of law.

It might be well to give at this point two articles of the Napoleonic *Code Pénal* referred to in the Decree of March 29 as applicable to the Jesuits.

291. No association of more than twenty persons that meets every day or on certain fixed days to deal with religious, literary, political, or other matters, shall be formed without the consent of the Government, and under the conditions it shall please the public authority to impose upon the society.—In the number of persons indicated in the present article are not comprised those who make

³ Cf. Anon., "The New Persecution in France" in *The Month*, 38 (January-June, 1880), 106-125.

⁴ Pierre de la Gorce, *Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française*, 5 volumes (Paris, 1922), II, 235-242, well explains this legislative action.

¹ Ernest Lavisse et Alfred Rambaud, *Histoire Générale*, 12 volumes (Paris, 1894-1901), XII, 29. Cf. Joseph Burnichon, S. J., "L'Article 14" in *Etudes*, 87 (April-June, 1901), 798-822, where a thorough discussion of an almost identical Article proposed for passage in the French Chamber of Deputies in 1901 is given.

² Anon., "The Suppression of the Congregations in France" in *The Dublin Review*, 35 (July-October, 1880), 155-183, 163. Here is given in full text in English translation the Report to the President of the French Republic, the Decree Against the Jesuits, and the Decree Against the Other Religious Congregations, together with addresses delivered in the Chamber and the historical setting of this incident.

their homes in the house where the association meets.

292. Every association of the above-mentioned nature that shall be formed without authorization, or which, after having obtained it, shall have infringed the conditions imposed upon it, shall be dissolved.—The heads, directors, or administrators of the association shall, moreover, be punished with a fine of from sixteen to two hundred francs.⁵

From the wording of these two articles, it is not clear that they even refer to religious congregations, since these really do not "meet" in a house at all, but "make their home" there. Moreover, these articles make void all laws to the contrary made before 1810 if there were any.

The Concordat of 1801 made between Pope Pius VII and Napoleon may well be considered the great charter establishing the official relationship between the Church and the State in France during the nineteenth century. It, too, is referred to in the Decree of March 29 and giving grounds for disbanding the congregations. The preamble of the decree states: "The Government of the Republic recognizes that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is the religion of the great majority of Frenchmen," and Article 1 reads: "The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion shall be freely practiced in France; its practice shall be public but in conformity with police regulations the Government shall judge necessary for the public peace."⁶ These statements do not mention the congregations, it is true, but they can be reasonably interpreted in favor of them. The least that can be said is that one must do violence to the wording of the text to wrest from it any argument in favor of repression. In fact, the general policy of the government under the Empire and the official declarations made while the Concordat was being negotiated were favorable to religious associations.⁷

The Law of Associations of 1834 (*Code sur les Associations*) restates, with explanations, Article 291 of the *Code Pénal* and again says nothing about religious societies.⁸ It refers to political organizations.

The many decrees, edicts, and laws of the Old Regime given out by the Bourbon court and the Parlements are also brought up to witness against the Jesuits. One is surprised that Republican France and "liberal" France, the France that is the fruit of the Revolution, a France that boasted of being or wanted to be as dissimilar from the old Bourbon France as it could be, should invoke as arguments of its own the arbitrary decrees of Bourbon autocracy and the high-handed *arrêts* of the pre-Revolutionary law courts, especially those of the Parlement of Paris. Not only politics but tyrannical prejudice also make strange bed-fellows. A more rabid statement against the Jesuits could have scarcely been made by the bitterest of their enemies on the eve of the suppression in the eighteenth century than that made by the republican M. Madier de Montjau in the Chamber of Deputies March 16, 1880, the day after the Senate rejected Article 7.

⁵ Anon., *Les Codes des Codes* (Paris, 1837), p. 548.

⁶ *Bullarii Romani Continuatio*, 18 volumes (Rome, 1835-1855), XI, 176.

⁷ Cf. Paul Dudon, S. J., "Le Concordat et les Congrégations" in *Etudes*, 86 (January-March, 1901), 623-644.

⁸ *Les Codes des Codes*, p. 825.

Men whom France never sees at work except for her degradation and her ruin—men for whose benefit a lying legend of heroism has been invented which they have never deserved—men whose footsteps are found wherever oppression and suffering are found, and whom I follow through history by the bloody track they have made, from the sixteenth century, which gave them birth, down to 1815, when they filled our southern provinces with rapine and murder—(Prolonged applause from the Left and Center) those disastrous and hateful men...twenty times condemned and branded before all the world and before this nation . . . under the eyes of a nation that breathes the breath of Rabelais, and lives by the spirit of Voltaire, of a people who may not know all that we know, but which hates these brigands by instinct . . . they have stretched out deadly arms on all sides to strangle their country, sucking out its money, its intellect, and its conscience! (Cheering from the Left and the Centre.)⁹

Sentiments similar to these were not foreign to other leaders in the Chambers, like Jules Ferry, Léon Gambetta, and Paul Bert.

We now turn to the reaction of the clergy of France to the Decree of March 29, 1880. Needless to say, a deluge of letters poured out of the Catholic press in the few weeks following. The religious congregations are an integral part of the Catholic Church. The Cardinal Archbishop of Rouen, in a letter of April 7, briefly and clearly states their position: "Doubtless, these Congregations do not constitute the essence of the Church. But they are the Church's natural product, just as the branches spring from the tree. They share the Church's life, and they diffuse that life around. They are the Church's organs . . . Suppress them, and you may truly be said to mutilate the Church."¹⁰

This was the general position; let this statement suffice to explain the matter as it touched all the Religious bodies, and let us turn to the Jesuits. April 12 the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Guibert, wrote:

Among the religious institutes, there is one which has been more before the world than the others; which has done splendid service in education, which has shed lustre on literature, which has formed *savants* of the first rank in every branch of science, which has sent missionaries to the extremities of the earth, which has carried civilization into the most barbarous countries, and which has made every shore red with the blood of its martyrs. Marked out by its importance and its success as an object of the hatred of religion, the Society of Jesus has always confounded calumny by the splendor of its virtues, its intellectual power, and its work. We have had it in full operation for fifty years in our midst . . . the Society of Jesus has been scrupulously exact in avoiding all interference with politics. Those who deny this, make assertions without proof. A Bishop like myself who has under his jurisdiction the chief Jesuit establishments in France is in a position to know the truth in a matter like this. It is this Society, this renowned Society, which the executive threatens with its extremest rigour. Parliament is not to be asked to recognize it; it is doomed to die; in three months it will disappear. . . . I was to see public liberty violently arrested in its course by party-prejudice, and the central Power dragged back to the ways and practices of forgotten despotism.¹¹

April 11 Cardinal Caverot of Lyons said: "I owe it to truth to declare here, that in the course of a ministry of well-nigh fifty years—twenty as priest, thirty as

⁹ *The Dublin Review*, *ibid.*, 158, 159. For more about anti-Jesuitism in this crisis by men like Paul Bert and Jules Ferry, cf. Alexandre Brou, *Les Jésuites de la Légende*, 2 volumes (Paris, 1906-1907), II, 305-315. A good account of the dealings of important people like the Pompadour, Louis XV, Choiseul, and some of the French lawyers on the eve of the Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the eighteenth century may be found in J. Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 6 volumes (Paris, 1844-1846), B, 218-286.

¹⁰ *The Dublin Review*, *ibid.*, 170, 171. Cf. also F. Desjacques, "L'Épiscopat Français et les Décrets du 29 Mars 1880" in *Etudes*, 5 Sixth Series (January-June, 1880), 641-651, 643.

¹¹ *The Dublin Review*, *ibid.*, 173, 174. The following extracts from letters taken from the same place.

(Please turn to page sixty)

Louisville's "Bloody Monday"—August 6, 1855

Leonard Koester

University of Louisville

A LOUISVILLIAN who climbed to the roof of his house during the night of August 6, 1855, between twelve and two, might think he were in a beleaguered city, according to a local newspaper. Roundabout Louisville the dwellings of so-called foreigners were burned down, and scarcely had the fire on the one side died down when a fresh one had already started elsewhere. Meanwhile, incessant shooting was kept up and agonized screaming could be heard.

Men infected with the madness of the mob filled the streets with outrage and the air with oaths. "Down with the Dutch and Irish! Move the damned foreigners!" Gangs of half-grown boys fired with whiskey roamed about with firearms and clubs. Even women, staid housewives and daughters, shrieked in uncontrolled passion, wishing "every German, every Irishman and all their descendants were killed, and every Catholic were cut up into mince meat."

The biggest fires were in the Eighth Ward, on Main Street between Eleventh and Twelfth Streets. In this immediate vicinity alone fifteen houses were destroyed. Stationing a cannon at Main and Eleventh, the mob first fired the corner building occupied by the Long Brothers. All three brothers tried to escape by way of the roof, but were shot at from the streets and high points of surrounding buildings. Two were unable to make their getaway and hanged to the banisters of their own house where their helpless mother saw them consumed by the flames. The third one managed to flee after receiving thirteen bullet wounds. He was brought to jail!

The fire spread from Long's to a brick building next door occupied by a German cigar maker and then to other buildings occupied mostly by Irish. The property was owned by Patrick Quinn and was known as Quinn's Row. The wealthy owner, who had a room in one of the houses, offered the incendiaries all his money if they would only spare his life; but they took his money and his life too.

While the buildings stood in flames, men, women and children were seen wringing their hands in anguish. Masked mobsmen were determined to trap the inhabitants and shot at anyone who appeared in a door or at a window. Some came out and were riddled with bullets; others, crazed by the fire and shooting, went back; a few escaped.

The mobsters allowed a woman with an infant in her arms to get out and pass through the crowd. When it was discovered that the "woman" was a man in disguise, cries were raised to kill him and shoot him, but luckily he escaped by jumping into a conveyance which quickly carried him away to safety.

Another attempted to escape, but was driven back after having been shot. Forced by the flames to come

out once more, he was again shot several times and driven into the blazing house a second time. Weakened by loss of blood he did manage, however, to crawl out the back way unnoticed. With his remaining strength he got as far as the paper-mill yard, where he found a hole in the sand bank and lay all night.

A woman who fled from her burning home with a baby in her arms was immediately surrounded by rascals who told her that she and her infant would both be killed, if she did not go back and fetch her husband. One of the gangsters grabbed her baby, and the frantic mother was compelled to run to her husband hiding in the house. As he then rushed out to the street to rescue the infant, he was beaten, shot, and left for dead. He expired later; his possessions had been burned, and his wife was left a helpless widow.

A local newspaper inquired: "And what has brought all this about? What necessity produced it? What harm had foreigners done here? None at all... They have failed in no duty to the State or to the Union. These execrable appeals to the bigotry of race and religion have come from the necessities of miserable demagogues, who want power . . . When all is peace the cry of danger is raised, and men have gone crazy at unseen horrors. Race is arrayed against race, and creed against creed, and men fall to cutting each other's throats . . .

"If there be wrongs to redress, is not this remedy worse than the disease? But what evil do you see? Has any foreigner interfered with your rights? Are you afraid of your Catholic neighbors? What harm do they propose to do? Are you not cheated and humbugged by a ridiculous bugbear? Can the Irish or the Germans do worse than this American party has done? . . . Is this feud of race and religion to be kept up? If so, what has been done will be repeated. This bigotry of race and religion cannot be controlled. Blood is its natural food; violence and intolerance will follow its footsteps forever. It is the world's experience, and will not change."

The American Party mentioned above is better known as the Know Nothing Party. At one time it seemed strong enough to put one of its men into office as president of the United States. One of its greatest strongholds during the last years of its existence as a national party was Louisville, Kentucky. One of its most ruthless leaders was George D. Prentice, editor of the *Louisville Journal*. Through his violent editorials the issues of the day were fanned to a white heat and certainly helped to precipitate the riot of Monday, August sixth, 1855, called "Bloody Monday". The immediate issue was the election of local and state officers. The candidates of the Know Nothing or American Party were supported by nativists, mostly of Anglo-Saxon origin,

temperance societies, puritans, observers of blue Sunday laws, and slave holders. The opposing candidates of the Democratic Party were supported by anti-nativists, Catholics, foreigners, mostly German and Irish, and liberals.

Bad feeling between the Know Nothings and the Democrats had existed in Louisville for some time. During the summer weeks preceding Bloody Monday, as also at the time of the spring election, there had been much evidence of rowdiness. A Dr. Muguet, a Frenchman, stood in his colleague's doorway, observing the rough election activities in the Second Ward, when some one appeared before him and asked whether he too were "a God — Dutchman." The physician replied that this was none of his business. Scarcely had he uttered these words, however, when he was struck a blow which knocked him out. During the spring election rowdies in the First, Second, and Third Wards were stationed at the polls and forcibly kept undesirable voters away by joining hands and spreading their legs. Many disgraceful happenings such as these occurred in Louisville prior to Bloody Monday.

It is no wonder then that the foreigners were pretty well intimidated by August 6. They felt that in the secret sessions of the Know Nothing Party plans for winning the election had been made which would stop at nothing. They had every reason to be fearful. Proper polling facilities were not provided. On election day the Know Nothings controlled and took possession of the polls. "Large crowds were stationed at the entrance to shove back Preston voters, while side and back doors were provided for Marshall men" (*Louisville Courier*). Those hardy souls who insisted on voting against the Know Nothings were forced to run a gauntlet, or handed out over the heads of the crowd to be dropped on the pavement, where they were frequently beaten, stabbed or stoned.

By noon, however, even the foolhardiest foreigners thought it most prudent to refrain from appearing at the polls. Then Know Nothing bullies, for lack of something to do, left the voting places and roamed the streets. Many had come in from neighboring towns, New Albany and Jeffersonville (across the Ohio River). Looking for excitement, they molested the foreigners wherever they could find them. Konrad Kissler, who had not gone out at all and who was quietly enjoying his pipe and beer at home, was suddenly attacked, the bullies threatening the lives of himself and his family, while demolishing his property.

The *Louisville Anzeiger* gives an hour-by-hour account of the riot: "It is now, at the moment we are writing this, two o'clock in the afternoon: noisy gangs of loafers are roaming through the streets. Something interesting can happen. We shall see.

"Election day, three p. m. The excitement is great. Just as we are writing this several loafers are getting the cannon from the fire department across the street and proceeding with it to the First Ward."

The First Ward was occupied mostly by Germans, and much of the fighting there took place on Shelby Street between Main and Broadway. Headed by a wav-

ing American flag, an armed gang quickly grew into a gangster army. Organized resistance on the part of the Germans was attempted but was overwhelmed and dispersed. "Most painful sights were witnessed. Poor women were fleeing with their children and with little mementoes of home that had been brought from the fatherland" (*Courier*). A woman whose husband had been badly wounded frantically sought entrance to homes nearby. Out of fear of being mobbed no one granted her aid and no door was opened to her. She was driven across the bridge.

Men were spared or slain entirely according to the caprice of the mob. A young German who had lived in Louisville only three weeks was beaten, and then in a hellish game of amusement was cast up and down a staircase until he was dead. Later on the house in which he had stayed was burned down.

Because someone had shot from one of the windows of Armbruster's brewery at a crowd pursuing a German, a party of Know Nothings under the leadership of Captain D. C. Stone proceeded to fire that large plant. While the cannon was being stationed directly in front and manned for action, the rabble first broke in, brought out the beer, and "swilled their fills." The \$25,000 brewery was then completely burned. The local German paper observed that "instead of extinguishing the fire, beer was drunk." The fire department saved no building unless it belonged to a Know Nothing. Mrs. Armbruster, who was carrying \$1,200 in gold, silver and paper, out of their dwelling adjoining, was knocked down and part of the money scattered among the rabble. One or two men were reported burned to death in the cellar of the home and seven or eight in the brewery itself. No one could get out without being shot. Some female employees of a nearby bakery fled to the attic in order to escape the fury of the mob; there they almost suffocated from the fire and smoke of the burning brewery. Years later, after a long drawn out lawsuit, the City of Louisville made a partial restitution to the Armbruster heirs for the losses suffered.

How much property was destroyed or damaged cannot be easily estimated. At the head of Jefferson and Green Streets more than twenty buildings were destroyed. Only one or two houses were spared on Bardstown Street. Cooperages on Main, coffee shops and taverns along Shelby, homes and groceries on other streets of the First Ward were riddled or burned.

Charles Heybach's elegantly furnished home was rifled and demolished and \$1,500 worth of liquor looted. Considering the price of drinks in those days—whiskey at a few cents per gallon—a great many thirsts were quenched with fancy and imported wines and liqueurs. "A loafer doesn't fight for principles, but like the landsknechte of yore for booty. If the reward is too slight, then he takes to looting" (*Anzeiger*). No less than eleven musket-ball marks could be seen in the upper front room. Expensive furniture was broken. A musical clock valued at \$600 was completely smashed.

The destruction in other wards of the city was not as general as in the First, due to the more scattered popu-

De Civitate Dei: An Analysis

Edmond J. Smyth, S. J.

Alma College

THIRTEEN years in the writing; twenty-two books the result; the matter, almost the gamut of Augustine's learning. Thus, perhaps, one could describe one of the most ambitious undertakings of the Bishop of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei*. Amidst the seemingly excessive verbiage¹—to our modern way of thinking—Augustine has bequeathed to mankind one of the fundamental interpretations of history.

Perhaps because of its spasmodic publication it little influenced his own age; nevertheless, it has influenced the history of the West. Breaking decisively with the past with its "divine" State, Augustine sought the principle of social order in the regulation of human will.²

Augustine was a man of his age, an age of the failure of the great secular empire, an age of material loss, but of spiritual gain, an age which laid the foundations of the spiritual unity of Western Europe, and in whose development Augustine's *City of God* was to play such a prominent part. It was an age of ruin and despair, but an age beyond which Augustine looked, beyond the sack of cities and the collapse of empires to the eternal reality of life. There were more important things to him than these failures. There was the ageless struggle between two worlds in which every man participated and which would only end in eternity.

Alaric and his warriors had swept down upon Italy, and Rome for the first time in over eight hundred years felt the oppressor's boot. Rome, "by which God was pleased to conquer the whole world, and subdue it far and wide by bringing it into one fellowship of government and laws," Eternal Rome had fallen. The news of the fall of Rome seemed to pagan and Christian alike the end of all things. St. Jerome, writing from Bethlehem had uttered the sentiments of many: "My voice, as I dictate, fails, choked with sobbing. The city which has taken the whole world captive is now herself captured! . . . When Rome falls . . . the world falls."³ But this was to be but the beginning of the fall, the end of a whole civilization and social order.

In the wake of the destruction which swept over the western world, and which Augustine so personally felt, the clamor against Christianity as the cause of that destruction ever grew. Out of these circumstances was born this great work of Augustine. For, as Augustine tells us in his *Retractions*:

Rome having been stormed and sacked by the Goths under Alaric their king, the worshipers of false gods or pagans, as we commonly call them, made an attempt to attribute this calamity to the Christian religion, and began to blaspheme the true God with even more than their wonted bitterness and acerbity. It was this which

kindled my zeal for the house of God, and prompted me to undertake the defense of the city of God against the charges and misrepresentations of its assailants.⁴

However, in the actual composition, the *City of God* is far more than a refutation of the pagan critics of Christianity. If it had been only that, its influence would have ceased long since. But, this refutation is lost in the broader issue of the relationship of Divine Providence to the Roman Empire, and the far broader one of the relationship of the Creator and Supreme Lawgiver to the origin, progress, and final destiny of mankind.

It has been written concerning Augustine's *City of God*:

It seems, however, that the term "philosophy of history" as applied to this and similar methods of historical interpretation is altogether misleading. More precisely, this type of philosophy of history is a theology of history, inasmuch as its fundamental premises, on which the whole structure is built and stands, come from religious beliefs and from their theological elaborations about the nature of the universe, of man and his destiny.⁵

Because of this, the work has been criticized as anti-historical since its interpretation follows a rigid theological pattern regarding the whole process of mankind's development as determined by timeless and changeless principles.

It is obvious that the *City of God* is not an inductive philosophical theory derived solely from historical facts. Augustine does not unearth the undiscoverable principles in history, but he does experience in history the working out of eternal principles. The result is a synthesis of man and history in the light of these principles. It is not strictly philosophical since it starts with revealed dogma and ends there. But this in no way detracts from the essential truth of the interpretation. As a matter of fact, it adds to the essential truth. However, the treatment is extremely rational in its deductions from Augustine's theory of human nature which follows necessarily from his theology of creation and grace. Furthermore, this process continues in the treatment of the nature, of society and law, and of the relationship between social life and ethics.

In the achievement of the refutation of the pagans—his original purpose—Augustine is eminently successful. Christianity's hostile critics had pointed out that it alone was responsible for the decline of Rome. Augustine, on his part, points out that Rome had suffered great reverses before Christianity had become widespread. The sack of Rome was due to her own internal weak-

⁴ St. Augustine, *Retractions*, ii, 43. Augustine, here, also explains the order of his work and concludes: "And so, though all these twenty-two books refer to both cities [the two groups, just and wicked, among God's rational creatures], yet I have named them after the better city, and called them the City of God."

⁵ George La Piana, "Theology of History," in *The Interpretation of History*, ed. Strayer (Princeton, 1943). On this same point, cf. Gilson, Etienne, *Le Thomisme* (Paris, 1944), p. 194.

¹ Henri Irénée Marrou, *Saint Augustin et al fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 1938), pp. 59-76.

² C. Dawson, *Enquiries into Religion and Culture*, "St. Augustine and His Age" (London, 1933), p. 258.

³ Migne, P. L., xxii, 1086, Lett. cxxvii, 12.

nesses, greatly accentuated by the depravity of individuals, manifested in cupidity, in thirst for power and luxury, and a gross neglect of the fundamental virtues.⁶

However, it is not our purpose to develop Augustine's arguments against Christianity's critics, but rather to mine the pure gold of his thought on the interpretation of history.

That Augustine set out to develop a reasoned interpretation of history as such may be seriously doubted. Even if, however, the *City of God* had never been written, it would be possible to obtain from his other works the historical interpretation of the great African, for this historical interpretation is nothing more than his philosophy of man applied to the collective level of the historical life of nations, composed of individuals. But that we would have obtained the same depth in the result seems doubtful, for it is only in the reading of the work that we start to realize the depth and breadth of Augustine's historical outlook.

The entire tone of the work is set by Augustine in the preface:

For the King and Founder of this city of which we speak, has in Scripture uttered to His people a dictum of the divine law in these words: "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble." But this, which is God's prerogative, the inflated ambition of a proud spirit also affects, and dearly loves that this be numbered among its attributes, to

"Show pity to the humbled soul,
And crush the sons of pride."

And therefore, as the plan of this work we have undertaken requires, and as occasion offers, we must also speak of the earthly city, which, though it be mistress of the nations, is itself ruled by its lust of rule.⁷

Thus has Augustine set apart the two cities. The one, the earthly city, will be mirrored by the Empire of Rome, which fell because it was not what it claimed to be, eternal. This, to Augustine, was the fallacious pretension of Rome; its principal error, the mistaking of relative for absolute values.

It would be well to note here with the late Professor Charles Cochrane⁸ that Augustine was not a malicious enemy of secular society, nor was he an "anarchist or a theocrat." He saw the real cause of Rome's decline and condemned it; he realized as well as his modern critic Gibbon that the institutions normal to civilized society could not be dispensed with.⁹ Furthermore, we should realize that Augustine in his conception of the nature of society neither followed the ancient theories of Aristotle, nor was he in turn followed by Aquinas in his conception of the State. The State, in Augustine's mind, was necessary only because of the vitiated nature of man, due to sin. The purpose of the State was to fill up, by its tranquillity of order, that gap caused by original sin. If man had not sinned, the State would not be necessary. Peace and tranquillity of order would flow necessarily from the unpolluted nature of man, hence destroying the necessity of any society to enforce them.

But back now to the original point. Augustine had condemned Rome because it had mistaken relative for

absolute values. But, for its devotees, Rome was all. It was self-sufficient. It was an absolute. This claim to self-finality Augustine emphatically denied. And what was true of Rome was true of the City of Man in general. Whereas Augustine conceived for the City of Man two specific marks, those of a provisional and instrumental society, it claimed for itself the marks of finality and eternity. But the City of Man cannot be eternal because it must end; it must be instrumental because it is not an end in itself.

On the other hand, there is the City of God, the world beyond time, the world of true peace and justice in which the strains and tensions of history are resolved and man experiences the perfect physical and spiritual integrity which is his; not an abstract something, but a real kingdom which is the crown and culmination of history and the realization of the destiny of the human race. Thus, perhaps, in brief could be expressed the historical thesis of the *City of God*. In order, however, to understand fully the implications of Augustine's interpretation, we must investigate further these ideas.

For Augustine the emphasis in history is necessarily on the individual; for it is the individual, not an impersonal institution that is to enjoy the eternal City of God. The principal problem faced by that individual is the demand for order and intelligibility in life. However, man in his solution of that problem is faced with a paradox within his own nature, the struggle between two inclinations, one towards good, the other towards evil. The psychological verification of this, Augustine finds in St. Paul. "For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do . . . But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members (Rom. vii)."

These two inclinations, and mankind's struggle to overcome the foreign law, this is the problem of history. Furthermore, for Augustine, man is a rational created being, embodying in himself a trinity, as it were, of existence, reason and love. By that love man cherishes his own existence, his own intelligence. By his free will man is capable of the determination of the "total-self". But this being is created by a Creator "who gives being to all that in any form exists."¹⁰ And, since being cannot exist without Him, His dominion over it must continually be in force. However, this nature has been vitiated by sin, the sin of pride; that pride which seeks to transcend its limitations.

And what is the origin of our evil will but pride? For "pride is the beginning of sin." And what is pride but the craving for undue exaltation? And this is undue exaltation, when the soul abandons Him to whom it ought to cleave as its end, and becomes a kind of end to itself. This happens when it becomes its own satisfaction. And it does so when it falls away from that unchangeable good which ought to satisfy it more than itself.¹¹

And in the life of history that existence and that reason and that love is corrupted because of sin, by which man has determined to love himself, not God. Man, in other words, "becomes a kind of end in himself." But, man has not been allowed to remain unaided in this polluted condition. Through the revelation of

⁶ *De Civitate Dei*, ii, 20.

⁷ *De Civitate Dei*, Preface.

⁸ C. Cochrane, *Augustine's City of God, Occasion, Purpose and Thesis of the Work* [unpublished manuscript].

⁹ *De Civitate Dei*, xix, 26.

¹⁰ *De Civitate Dei*, xxii, 24.

¹¹ *De Civitate Dei*, xiv, 13.

(Please turn to page sixty-four)

The Cyprus Convention of June 4, 1878

Albert J. Loomie, S. J.

Fordham Prep

THE comparative peace and quiet that pervaded Europe's chancelleries in the spring of 1876 was the disquieting peace that precedes a storm. The Eastern Question was ominous, and while everyone sensed the danger, many felt helpless in the face of it.

In London the atmosphere was most uncertain; Lord Derby's procrastination had left Britain with an inconclusive policy and had neutralized the efforts of the rest of the European Consort to reach a solution. By May, 1876, Serbia and Montenegro were at war, and the Russians were restless over their opportunity for Pan-Slavic expansion in the Southwest. With the fabric of the decrepit Ottoman Empire rotted and decayed, Derby faced the odious alternatives of the generous support of Turkey, as Eliott advocated, or the "bold initiative in partition," proposed by Salisbury in 1877.¹ When Russia went to war with Turkey in April of 1877, Beaconsfield resorted in exasperation to every stratagem to overcome the tortoise-like propensities of Derby's *laissez-faire* attitude. On March 21, 1878, the aggressive Salisbury succeeded Derby. It was three weeks later that the humiliating terms of the treaty of San Stefano were imposed on the Porte.

The clauses in the treaty that were most disturbing to the two imperialists at England's helm were those allowing Russian dominance in the Aegean and the formation of a large Bulgarian state that would eventually become the vassal of St. Petersburg.² It was the time for decision. The immediate object of English strategy must be the removal of this Russian influence from the Aegean and the assurance of Turkish control over the regions north of it to the Balkans.

The extent of the Russian aggrandizement in Asia Minor was equally alarming to the two India-minded statesmen.³ Fortunately, the ruinous clauses of the San Stefano capitulation affected other powers as well, and a revision of them by the European congress became a foregone conclusion. This paper will attempt to outline the significance of the Anglo-Ottoman Alliance as the keynote of a triad of diplomatic *rapprochements* that made up the British efforts to reach a peaceful solution of the crisis before the Berlin Congress.

In all these intrigues caution was still the watchword. Any further dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire would be obviously imprudent. The tradition of Turkish dominance in the eastern Mediterranean was strong and useful, the French were very jealous of their susceptibilities in Egypt, and the *Dreikaiserbund* with its

avowed defense of the *status quo* in Europe left the situation uncertain should England act alone. The Foreign Office stood at the crossroads. If England continued to neglect the onerous burden of the Turkish Empire—a path opened up by her bargain with the Khedive in March 25, 1875—she would lose a valuable ally in the East. Yet partition was tempting and perhaps easier. A defensive alliance was decided upon as the best solution. To the harrassed Porte protection by England might well seem to be the essential factor in any prolongation of the life of her moribund Empire. Salisbury insisted that the independence of the Porte would be a mockery without English protection.⁴ Various agents and officials in the Ottoman Empire such as Layard and Col. Home maintained that a reform of Turkey was possible under a benevolent Britannic inspiration and polite coercion.

In a cabinet discussion,⁵ as far back as March 27, Disraeli had divided up the situation into two parts: the first was Turkey in Europe where, as to the Balkans, cooperation with Austria could be expected; and the other was Turkey in Asia where England must act alone. Russia would be more insistent on her gains in Asia Minor, and the acquisition of some English stronghold there seemed an imperative counterbalance. Beaconsfield had decided early that a *place d'armes* in the East was the *sine qua non* of an aggressive defense.

The Asiatic conquests of Russia as the result of its war with Turkey were considerable: extending close to Armenia they went as far as Bayazid and the valley of Alashkert including the important caravan centers of Kars and Khartoum. Salisbury appraised this advance in terms of the balance of power and said: "The mere presence of the Russians at Kars will cause Persia, Mesopotamia and Syria to turn their faces northward. Then a Russian party will arise . . . and chaos will follow of which in some form or another the Russians will take advantage to reduce the port to impotence and to turn its provinces into Russian satrapies."⁶

As we shall see later, this reasoning had several ramifications. England was just recovering from a depression, the exploitation of Persia and the Tigris-Euphrates valley, the projection of a railway through this region, a new overland route through Asia Minor to India: all were receiving more and more attention in the speculations of the monied interests at home.⁷ But the primary effect of the Russian advance to Kars was to force England into a defensive alliance with Turkey⁸ and

¹ Lady Gwendolyn Cecil, *Life of Salisbury* (London, 1921), II, 134.

² Salisbury to Beaconsfield, 21 March, 1878, quoted in Cecil *op. cit.* 2, p. 213-214 cf. H. Temperley & L. Penson, *Foundations of British Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 365, 366.

³ Dwight Lee, "Great Britain and the Cyprus Convention," *Harvard Historical Studies*, vol. XXXVIII (Cambridge, 1934), p. 35.

⁴ W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli* (London, 1920), VI, 291.

⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 264; cf. Cecil, *Salisbury*, II, 270; Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁶ Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

⁷ Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁸ Salisbury to Layard, May 10, quoted in Temperley: "Disraeli and Cyprus," *English Historical Review*, XLVI, 277.

even to the assumption of the office of *protectrix* of the oppressed Armenians to satisfy the indignant public.

With the defensive alliance with the Porte assuming a more important part in the pre-Berlin intrigues, a choice of a *place d'armes* in the East would seem to be something for mature and careful deliberation. The evidence shows another picture: "... the acquisition of Cyprus was the result of a hasty decision, based on imperfect information . . . mature deliberation would have selected a position on the Persian Gulf in preference."⁹

The final determination on Cyprus was due to the memorandum submitted by Col. Home to Gen. Simmons, later military adviser to Beaconsfield at Berlin. The decision to take Cyprus was made early in May, and in reviewing Col. Home's paper, we can see the reasoning that ultimately influenced Beaconsfield.¹⁰

Home assumes that British interests are to be found in Asiatic rather than in European Turkey. A *place d'armes* is needed, he warns, to check the Russian advance along the Gulf of Persia or towards the Suez Canal. The place selected should not be too near Constantinople or too far from Syria. Alexandretta was too impractical, since the mountains nearby rendered troop action difficult; furthermore, like Alexandria it would involve dangerous commitments on land. Cyprus alone fulfills all the political, military, naval and commercial requirements. "In short, whoever holds Cyprus, holds Scanderoon (Alexandretta)."¹¹

The choice of Cyprus should not be dealt with merely in the light of the crisis of 1878 but also in view of expansion in Mesopotamia: "Even if this crisis had never arisen, it might well have been thought desirable to strengthen the British position in the Levant, and to secure some vantage grounds for watching over the development of Syria and Mesopotamia, both might be of fundamental importance for safeguarding the road to India."¹²

Some contemporary criticism in the press linked up the choice of Cyprus and the "semitic interests" of Disraeli. Zionism was of some public interest at the time, but as can be seen from the actual negotiations and strategy of the Foreign Office in this alliance, playing Quixote for the Zionists is not to be a likely role in such high politics.¹³

No matter what the motive or motives involved in the final choice of Cyprus by Disraeli, the choice was finally made, and the energetic Layard at Constantinople was given the task of actual negotiation. The personality of the man and not the actual offers of

Great Britain seems to be the real reason for the *successful* conclusion of this alliance. He was enthusiastic all along for the alliance¹⁴ and even forced the Sultan to sign on the eve of May 30, 1878, without complete instructions from London to back him up. He can be seen in his many dispatches to Salisbury as a curious mixture of the imperialist and the humanitarian, keeping a benevolent eye on the oppressed Christians and eager withal to expand British influence. A typical remark of his, would be the following on the Turkish situation: "The influence of England is, I am persuaded, paramount at the present moment in the East. We might yet avail ourselves of it to promote the happiness and welfare of a large portion of the human race, and our own interests at the same time."¹⁵

The actual *rapprochement* planned by Salisbury had but two points, the Porte's assurance of good government in Asiatic Turkey and the concession of Cyprus to England. In his letters to Layard he stipulated that any arrangement with Constantinople was contingent on the Russian retention of the Armenian conquests.¹⁶

With Shuvalov's announcement on May 22, that Armenia would remain in her present russified state, the negotiations with the Sultan were feverishly prosecuted. In answer to a telegram to London on May 19 for help, money and alliance, Layard was to announce the terms of the alliance and get the Sultan to agree to the cession of Cyprus. Threats were to be resorted to as it seemed best: "If he the Sultan had not accepted the proposal he was to be warned that England would abandon her opposition to Russia's advance and desist from all further attempts to postpone the partition of the Empire."¹⁷

The Sultan was easily influenced by Layard to sign, and no threats were used.

At home Salisbury had been preparing the public for the news of the treaty by the sop of "specific assurances of good government to Asiatic Christians."¹⁸ The Foreign Secretary was shrewd enough to realize that after the occupation of the island, public opinion would jell into a righteous sense of proprietorship: "It (the public) will cling to any military post occupied by England as tenaciously as it has clung to Gibraltar; and if any movements were made which would threaten it while attacking the Ottoman dominions, its actions might be counted on."¹⁹

Salisbury seemed well satisfied with the new acquisition of a *place d'armes* in the East. Two weeks before in a telegram to Layard, he had overruled the latter's objections to Cyprus in the following words: "It has the double advantage of vicinity both to Asia Minor and Syria, it would enable us without any act of overt hostility and without disturbing the peace of Europe, to accumulate material of war and, if requisite, the troops

⁹ Temperley, "Further Evidence on Disraeli and Cyprus," *ibid.*, p. 460.

¹⁰ For the full text cf. Dwight Lee, "A Memorandum Concerning Cyprus, 1878," *Journal of Modern History*, III, 235-41.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 241. This memorandum was submitted later than the date of the actual choice of Cyprus, but it contains the arguments most akin to Disraeli's reasoning. *Vid.* Temperley, "Further Evidence . . . EHR, XLVI, 459.

¹² James Headlem-Morley, *Studies in Diplomatic History* (London, 1930), p. 203.

¹³ Some have even liked to link the choice of Cyprus to a passage in Disraeli's musty novel "Tancred," Book IV, Chap. 1: *vid.* Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 8; Temperley, "Disraeli and Cyprus," EHR, XLVI, p. 274. A discussion of the Zionist agitation of the 1880's is found in Hedlem-Morley, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-7.

¹⁴ Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 78, 80, 83.

¹⁵ Layard desp. No. 525, quoted in Lee: *op. cit.*, p. 75.

¹⁶ Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 83; cf. also the letter to Waddington quoted below.

¹⁷ Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. 271, Telegram of May 25, 1878.

¹⁸ Cf. text of treaty in Hedlem-Morley, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

¹⁹ Salisbury to Layard, April 18, 1878, quoted in Mihailo D. Stojanovic, *The Great Powers and the Balkans* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 258.

necessary for operations in Asia Minor and Syria, while it would not excite the jealousy which other powers would feel at any acquisition on the mainland."²⁰

As to the proposed reforms in the governing of Asiatic Christians, a scrutiny of the terms of the convention leaves one with an impression of vagueness. In later years the reforms were promoted by a corps of irritatingly zealous counselors who naively attempted to straighten out the age-old crooked paths of Ottoman duplicity. Their efforts were a signal failure.²¹

As the convention of June 4th stood, only one of the methods for bolstering Turkey and safeguarding the route to India was explicit and that was the occupation of Cyprus.²² This occupation Salisbury consistently referred to as "provisional" in the secret explanation forwarded to Waddington the night before the news of an Ottoman alliance leaked out into the press. In view of the fact that Cyprus was now in the hands of a nation that had clung tenaciously to all its other Mediterranean outposts, the following words of Salisbury sounded strained: "There was just ground of hope that the Russians will find in a short time that the territory they have acquired is costly and unproductive: that the chances of making it a stepping stone to further conquests is cut off, and that they will abandon it as a useless acquisition. In that case our *raison d'être* at Cyprus will be gone and we shall retire."²³

While the secret Cyprus Convention was really an anti-Russian move on the part of Salisbury and Layard, there was still a chance for agreement with Russia on certain points in the Balkan crisis. A secret protocol was drafted in London on May 30, that was the result of both countries' evident desire for peace.²⁴ In brief, Russia conceded the reduction of the Bulgarian state and a restriction to her influence in the Balkans and Asia Minor. Salisbury had long since been driven to the wise conclusion "that it would be far preferable to extract Russian Concessions in Europe by relative complaisance in Asia."²⁵ The widely acclaimed April 1 Circular of Salisbury²⁶ received several setbacks,²⁷ but with Cyprus and Ottoman goodwill in his pocket, the Foreign Secretary could permit such a compromise in order to achieve his greater aims. Public reaction was, on the whole, unfavorable.²⁸

The negotiations with Austria were a part of Britain's efforts to increase her influence in the essential revision of San Stefano. Austria needed help in acquiring Bosnia and Herzegovina; Britain's price was a free hand in Turkey-in-Asia. Their similar viewpoints on Bulgaria assured a concerted opposition to Russian advance south

of the Balkans, and to any modifications of the Serbian frontiers.²⁹

The Cyprus Convention, we must remember, was only part of an over-all plan to secure "peace with honor" at the Berlin Congress. These agreements with Turkey, Austria and Russia were typical of the frantic efforts of the Consort to get as strong a position as possible before the Congress opened.³⁰

These three negotiations all produced definite results. Austria-Hungary gave a large measure of cooperation to Britain at the Congress; Russia explored the most likely subjects of conflict with her, and in some cases found a solution; and the Sultan indicated a basis on which England might work in the future for the preservation of Turkey-in-Asia. To Salisbury—profoundly influenced as he was by his term of Office as Secretary of State for India-Asia Minor—was undoubtedly more important than the Balkans.³¹

Appreciation of the nature of this Anglo-Ottoman alliance is impossible unless it is seen to have been really a gamble on the part of England before it went to Berlin. "If the Porte had refused its consent to what both Beaconsfield and Salisbury appear to have regarded as a vital factor in the settlement as a whole, the undertakings given to Shuvalov would presumably have had to have been withdrawn."³² The unavoidable *blamage* that would have ensued, had the gamble failed, would have made the work of Disraeli at Berlin doubly difficult. This accounts for the fruitless efforts at secrecy in the negotiations of the alliance.³³ Yet in this time of crisis, the convention was the best course open to Salisbury and Disraeli. "The Cyprus Convention was the key to the whole situation; though the arrangement with Europe was practically complete, it was not signed until after the other part of the settlement—that concerning Asia—had been carried through, and if the Asiatic project had failed, the whole plan which was the basis for the Congress of Berlin would have fallen to the ground."³⁴

Seton-Watson concedes that in "Beaconsfield's mind" the Ottoman alliance was the keystone of the foreign policy of the spring of 1878, but he rejects its importance in the actual turn of events. He believes that the earlier signing of the London Protocol was a "commitment from which it would have been no longer possible to recede even if Turkey rejected the scheme."³⁵ This opinion can be reconciled with the thesis of this paper by two comments. First, Salisbury was confident that the Turks would seek English protection, and that the alliance would be successfully negotiated. Secondly, the Asiatic-minded Salisbury held the *de facto* acquisition of Cyprus to be of primary importance in Britain's imperial policy.

A word about the aftermath of the Convention is

²⁰ Cecil: *op. cit.*, p. 269.

²¹ The best account of this noble experiment is in Lee, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-7.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 85-6.

²³ Lord Newton, *Life of Lord Lyons* (London, 1913), II, 383.

²⁴ B. H. Sumner, *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880* (Oxford, 1937), has the negotiations and text. pp. 645-61 (Appendix VIII).

²⁵ R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question* (London, 1935), p. 419.

²⁶ Text in Temperley, *Foundations*, p. 372-380.

²⁷ Discussed in Duke of Argyll, *The Eastern Question*, II, pp. 130-35.

²⁸ Seton-Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 420-21.

²⁹ The whole negotiations and *pourparlers secrets* are given an excellent discussion in William A. Gauld, "The Anglo-Austrian Agreement of 1878," *English Historical Review*, XLI, 108-112.

³⁰ For the unsuccessful attempt to get Italy in March, 1878, into a Mediterranean league under England's hegemony, cf. Dwight Lee, "The Proposed Mediterranean League of 1878," *Journal of Modern History*, III, 33-45.

³¹ Temperley, *Foundations*, p. 365.

³² Seton-Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 422. See also G. C. Thompson, *Beaconsfield and Public Opinion* (London, 1886), II, 78-81.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 422.

³⁴ Medlem-Morley, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-99; cf. Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

³⁵ Seton-Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 430-31.

necessary to round out our picture of its full effect on the Mediterranean higher politics of 1878-1880. With the reappearance of Gladstone in office a new shift in emphasis occurred in British Foreign Policy that destroyed any real *fructification* of Disraeli's dreams in Cyprus. Gladstone, however, feared to disavow the convention for fear of giving Russia a free hand in Armenia. "Ten years later all that was left of the Cyprus Convention was the occupation by England of an island that was Greek in nationality and gradually becoming estranged from England; a defensive alliance with Turkey that was never invoked; and a vague promise to bring the Sultan to reforms . . . which was evaded, if not broken, in 1895."³⁶

While the aftermath of the Cyprus Convention shows nothing but a shambles of wrecked dreams, as a piece of strategy before the Berlin Conference, it must receive praise as an adequate temporary expedient in Britain's forward policy of Imperialism. Disraeli summed up the situation perfectly when he wrote: "In taking Cyprus, the movement is not Mediterranean but Indian."³⁷

³⁶ Taylor: "The European Powers and the Near East, 1875-1908," *Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in the Social Sciences*, Number 17 (Minneapolis, 1925), p. 118.

³⁷ Disraeli, July 18, 1878, quoted in Temperley, "Disraeli and Cyprus," *EHR*, XLVI, 279.

The French Decree

(Continued from page fifty-two)

bishop—I have been able to satisfy myself, and I know, that these worthy and zealous servants of God have well deserved the distinction given to the Society by the Church . . ." The Archbishop of Tours and his suffragans wrote on April 4: ". . . how can it be pretended that these religious . . . have the popular feeling against them? Our Catholic people press in crowds round their pulpits; wherever they open a College, the trust and confidence of families fills it instantly; and there are no priests to whom the faithful apply more willingly for the direction of conscience." And Cardinal de Bonnechose on April 7:

The Jesuits devote themselves to the laborious and often thankless task of education. They open colleges; experience justifies their efforts; families entrust their children to them with the utmost confidence; year by year, public opinion and the Government itself, testify to their success; year by year, they send forth into every career young men who have been taught to respect authority, who are penetrated with the idea of duty; who are fitted to become brave soldiers, conscientious functionaries, and honourable and useful citizens, and who are every one devoted to their country and ready to die for France.

The Archbishop of Cambrai, Cardinal Regnier, wrote a forceful protest to President Grévy on April 8:

On my conscience, and in the name of truth, President of the French Republic, I bear witness that these religious men, who have so long been abused, spit upon, and calumniated by the anti-Christian press with a malice which no authority has ever attempted to restrain—who are devoted day by day to the hatred and the violence of the mob as though they were an association of malefactors—that these religious are esteemed and venerated in the highest degree by the clergy and by every class of the faithful, and that they are in every way most worthy of it.

These protestations in behalf of the Religious in France were warmly seconded by Pope Leo XIII. He sent his legate in France to lodge a formal protest with the government. Under date of October 22, 1880, he

sent a letter to Cardinal Guibert praising him for the letters sent to the President of the Republic, to the head of the ministry, and to the Minister of the Interior in behalf of the congregations. The Holy Father commends the other bishops for complaints to the government, praised the religious and the Society of Jesus by name for their work for souls, and expressed disappointment for the present but hope for the future.¹²

Churchmen were not the only ones who saw injustice in the March Decree. M. Rousse, an eminent French jurist, drew up his famous consultation between the time the decree was issued and its enforcement, showing its invalidity and tyranny and cutting the ground from under "the existing laws" it appealed to in justification of its action against the congregations. His document ran to 300 pages and was signed by some 2000 jurists and lawyers. Some 200 procurators of the Republic and advocates general gave in their resignation rather than enforce the decree. The people appealed to God against the injustice being done to their great spiritual benefactors by pilgrimages to Paray-le-Monial, La Salette, and St. Michel. Special devotions were held at Montmartre, at the tomb of St. Genevieve, at Notre Dame de Paris, and other places, and crowds thronged the great sanctuaries all over France.¹³

But what was the reaction of the religious themselves in all this? A Jesuit wrote at the time: "The Society of Jesus is dissolved without due process of law. Authorization refused it formally and in advance. By an iniquitous provision a decree of the executive power excludes it from the right of addressing itself to the Chambers if it so desires to obtain a recognition which only they can grant or refuse."¹⁴ The Jesuit philosopher Santo Schiffrini, driven from the Jesuit scholasticate at Laval with the other Jesuits when the Decree of March 29 was executed, wrote from his place of exile at St. Helier in the Isle of Jersey to his brother under date of September 15, 1880, as follows:

It won't take long to tell you how I came here. You know already, through the papers, what was the action of the French Chamber with regard to the well-known "Clause 7" of the Ferry Laws, and hence the origin of the lamentable March Decrees. At their appearance, all the Superiors of Religious Congregations of men, threatened by the said Decrees, with great though unexpected unanimity, met at Paris to see what they ought to do in such a juncture. It was resolved to offer every assistance sanctioned by French law . . . In the meantime we kept up our usual scholastic exercises at Laval, without the slightest change in the order of duties. Towards the end of June, for fear the government would assume control of the house, all the more necessary articles were sent to a safe place in the town, and it was settled where each one could best go in case the house was broken up. A generous and cordial hospitality was extended us from every side. On the 28th and 29th of June many of our friends and of the highest nobility came to stay with us night and day, so as to help us if necessary, or (and this was the chief object) to serve as witnesses to the brutality soon to take place on the part of the vandals who now govern poor France.¹⁵

¹² *Leonis XIII. Pontificis Maximi Acta*, 26 volumes (Romae, 1878-1903), II, 144-151. Four years later, February 8, 1884, the Sovereign Pontiff addressed another letter, "Nobilissima Gallorum Gens," to the French people, reviewing the events that had transpired among them during the past few years, exhorting them, and making recommendations. Cf. *ibid.*, IV, 10-22.

¹³ *The Dublin Review*, *ibid.*, 181-183. Cf. also *La Civiltà Cattolica*, IV Eleventh Series (July-December, 1880), 505.

¹⁴ *Etudes* as above in Note 10, 645.

¹⁵ *Woodstock Letters*, X (1881), 65, 66.

That was about all the Jesuits could do. Appeal to the Chambers was out of the question. So was appeal to the courts of law, as the government already considered the members of the Society of Jesus as condemned men and would simply send the police to execute the sentence and expel them by force at the appointed time. On this let us hear Father Schiffini further:

The 30th arrived, and there is no need of describing what occurred. In Laval, as elsewhere, the performance consisted of three acts, viz.: a notice to quit, served by the Chief of Police; a refusal to do so on the Rector's part, in the presence of witnesses, accompanied by a protest against the illegal measures of the government; and, lastly, after the seals had been affixed to the Church, our ejection, *manu militari*, regardless of the laws which, in France, so strictly protect the dwellings of citizens.¹⁶

Another contemporary account of the events of June 30 is as follows:

At the same hour, at the only time that they were able with an appearance of legality to carry out the abominable deed, Delegates of the Police with agents and with a band of men armed with hooks, scalpels, pries, and axes presented themselves at four o'clock in the morning of June 30 at the door of the Jesuit houses. Not finding them open, they forced them and battered them in, with the right with which the conquerors of Rome on September 20, 1870, made a breach with cannon in the Porta Pia and made their entrance into the Pontifical Palace on the Quirinal with hooks.

They then informed the superiors of the respective houses that they had come to execute the Decree of March 29. The superiors protested in good form against this violence done to liberty and to the inviolability of domicile in the presence of authoritative witnesses. But the Police, going from cell to cell into which the Religious had retired, expelled them one after the other, forcing them out when they refused to go in any other way than by the sheer force of the agents and the gendarmes who, though they seemed ashamed of the necessity of having to perform so odious an act, did it none the less . . . Nor did they have any regard for the age or the malady of the designated victims.¹⁷

One cannot help wondering what the 35,000,000 Catholics in France out of the total population of 36,000,000 in 1880 were thinking about all this, and what they were doing about it. Very many, of course, were in sympathy with the Jesuits, as the above narrative goes on to show:

At the appearance of each Jesuit at the door of the house, accompanied by two guards who put him out on the street, there was a cry which bespoke execrations for such a crime: "Long live the Jesuits!" "Long live Liberty!" And this cry became louder when they were seen to carry and almost drag out venerable old men and octogenarians, borne down with infirmities contracted in the services of the sacred ministry and in works of charity, in the dungeons of the galley-slaves of Guiana! . . . In truth, the Commissioners and the agents comported themselves very humanely as far as they were able under such circumstance.¹⁸

Father Schiffini writes in the same strain:

It must be confessed that the gens-d'armes conducted themselves with a great deal of courtesy, and carried out their orders with tears in their eyes. Also be it said that the Prefect of Laval was among the least hostile, and, as a consequence, suffered the Brothers, and

even five Fathers, to still remain in the house, in quality of legal proprietors. It is a hard necessity that presses one, when, for the sake of a few dollars that he needs, he follows, with bad grace, the Republican car driven by Gambetta. After we were turned into the street, with the exception of a few Fathers who remained in the town, we all, to the number of about a hundred, betook ourselves to four houses thrown open to us in the neighborhood of the city . . .¹⁹

The penalty inflicted by the Decree of March 29 was thus carried out, but not well followed up. Some of the Jesuits continued to live on in France, even in community, in private houses and were not molested by the police. Individual members occupied important professorial chairs in the universities. Although many of the communities were moved to England or Spanish territory, many of the Fathers were in their native country in seminaries, colleges, and parishes. Gradually they came back. In 1885 colleges were comparatively prosperous in Vannes, Evreux, Mans, Tours, Poitiers, Vau-girard, and Bordeaux. These all belonged to the Jesuit Province of France. And in that year a Congregation of the Province of France met at Paris. Of course, we know that another storm swept down upon them in 1901, but that is another story.

By the Decree of March 29, 1880, three or four score of Jesuit houses were disbanded.²⁰ Twenty-eight of these were secondary schools caring for 11,000 students. Thus Catholic education in France was dealt a severe blow. But the dissolution of the Society of Jesus was only the beginning. Numerous other religious houses were disbanded, too. As the bishops of France and so many other men of vision clearly foresaw, it would be first the Jesuits, then the other congregations, then the Catholic Church in general. In this same year the Sunday rest was abolished for those employed on public works, and a new tax of 5% imposed on those congregations still allowed to live. In 1882 primary education was made obligatory and lay; then the crucifix was removed from the communal schools. In 1884 divorce was established and Catholic theological faculties suppressed. By a law of 1886 a religious might not teach in a communal school. In 1889 seminarians and even members of the clergy were no longer exempt from military service. In 1892 funds for Catholic seminaries were no longer forthcoming. Great retrenchment was made in the budget for worship in the following year. In many cities processions were forbidden, and, contrary to Article 14 of the concordat, support for the clergy was taken away.²¹ The next decade would bring the Law of Association, and the Act of Separation that would destroy the great concordat altogether.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁷ *La Civiltà Cattolica*, IV Eleventh Series (July-December, 1880), 247, 248. The *London Times* wrote that evening: "The dispersion of the Jesuits is an act of despotism. If the Republic revives laws that violate personal liberty, it is merely substituting the tyranny of the multitude for the tyranny of an individual." Quoted in Fernand Mourret, *Histoire Générale de L'Eglise* (Paris, 1921), IX, 67. L. Andrieux, the Prefect of Police at the time, later wrote in his memoirs: "It was necessary to put out on the street defenseless priests. Their attitude of prayer, their meditative and resigned countenances, and the blessing they gave in leaving to the kneeling faithful, contrasted painfully with the use of public force. It was not necessary to be of the Catholic faith to experience the impression which I have described." *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *La Civiltà Cattolica* as in Note 17, 248.

¹⁹ *Woodstock Letters*, *ibid.*

²⁰ The figures vary. Hergenroether-Kirsch, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*, 4 volumes (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1911-1917), IV, 580, gives the number of Jesuit "schools" closed as seventy-four. Other figures may be found in Raymond Corrigan, *The Church and the Nineteenth Century* (Milwaukee, 1938), p. 222.

²¹ Cf. Lavissee et Rambaud, *op cit.*, 12, 537. A good brief account of these troublous times for the French church is given in Joseph Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der Neusten Zeit*, 3 volumes (Munich, 1933-1935), II, 426-435. The many excellent works referred to there are of special value.

"Bloody Monday"

(Continued from page fifty-four)

lation of foreigners, but it was just as intense wherever it did occur; witness the burning of Quinn's Row. The acts of violence were no less maniacal.

Georg Hubert, an old German residing at Ninth and Chestnut, went to Portland Avenue to inspect a cow. At the corner of Tenth Street he saw a wounded man lying on the ground who was still being shot at. Running away from the scene to avoid trouble, Hubert was nonetheless followed and soon was surrounded by the rascals, one of whom deliberately shot him in the chest. Another old German living on Portland Avenue between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets lay sick in his bed. When he heard the mob approach, he got up and in his fright crawled underneath the bed. But the rascals entered the sickroom, pulled out the patient, and shot him through the heart.

As the day advanced, the horror increased. The *Daily Democrat* reports how a man who was chased across Beargrass Creek, jumped over a fence and hid himself in a yard. "His pursuers followed him, caught and bruised him badly, and were then about to hang him—took him to Preston street bridge with intention of drowning him but changed their purpose—held him suspended by the heels outside of the bridge over the water—then took him to the water's edge, and holding on to him plunged him into the creek several times head first. When at last rescued from the mob, he was well-nigh dead, and appeared to be nothing but a mass of mud and filth."

The following account, given in several sources, probably describes the viciousness of this miserable day to the satisfaction of even a person hardened by events of the mid-twentieth century. Late in the afternoon, "a genteelly dressed foreigner" passed the southeast corner of the Courthouse and gave way to a group of men coming in his direction, when the cry was raised, "Move the d—d foreigner!" Producing short sticks filled with lead, they caught him, knocked him down, and beat him almost to "jelly." Someone asked for a hatchet with which to cut off the hapless man's head. Another did happen to have a large pitchfork handy and actually thrust it into the victim. He was then dragged down the street. In the procession was the man with the pitchfork, blood still dripping from the prongs. After a while this individual stuck a loaf of bread on the fork and, shouldering it, continued the march. The victim, more dead than alive, was deposited in jail; his assailants were free to move on.

The *Anzeiger* inquires: "On which side is barbarism greater? Among wild Indians or among people who lay claim to civilization? The barbarian has no school teachers, no preachers, no literature and no press . . . The enlightened people (may the Lord forgive the *Journal*) has teachers en masse, preachers in frightening superabundance, thousands and again thousands of confusedly written laws circulated and read day for day by thousands of lawyers . . . But to complete the comparison with cannibalism, they murder children in the

arms of the mother,—they injure the sick, the aged and women."

The papers do report that a woman, infant in arm, was slashed in the breast; that mothers and children threw themselves between assailants and the attacked husband and father, begging for mercy; also that some fiend "put the muzzle of the weapon to a child's head, fired and dashed its brains over its mother's arms" (*Daily Louisville Times*). Mother and child had just escaped from the fire which consumed the father. "It has now been determined almost beyond all doubt, that during the conflagration of the Irish houses in the Eighth Ward 'ladies' encouraged the incendiaries with their cheers. The *Democrat* wishes for the fellow who shot the infant in its mother's arm that he might get the most beautiful of these ladies as a prize. Are these not fine portraits of manners and morality?" (*Anzeiger*).

Whether the story of the murdered infant is true or whether the report of other atrocities are true, especially in details, can be determined only with difficulty, if at all. Passions were heated, opinions were at loggerheads, and different eyes saw different things. To be sure, only one of the five newspaper companies publishing in Louisville at the time, the *Journal* and its affiliates, served as an organ for the Know Nothings. Its editor, publisher and part owner, George D. Prentice, defended the nativists, of course, and blindly, if not brazenly, put the blame squarely on the foreigners. Since the Know Nothings had won the election by force and were in power, it became expedient for the opposition to tone down reports. Things probably happened which no paper dared to report. The argument was also advanced that by depicting details the prospects of the city would be injured—an opinion which prevailed for a long time, so that accounts of Bloody Monday frequently contented themselves with generalizations or ignored important sources.

For their opposition the *Anzeiger* was threatened by the mob once and the *Louisville Times* twice. Only the intervention of John Barbee, the Know Nothing mayor, saved the latter. His reasoning was that next to the *Times* stood a building owned by a brother, a K. N. brother. Should the mob fire the *Times* building, this building, too, might be destroyed in the conflagration. A compromise was struck by tearing down the signs and defacing the front of the structure. "The splendid morality of a reform party!" ejaculated the *Anzeiger*. What or who saved the *Anzeiger* is not stated anywhere.

To the mayor's credit it must be stated that he also saved St. Martin's Church on Shelby Street as well as the Catholic Cathedral of the Assumption on Fifth. The report had circulated that they were full of weapons, powder, and foreigners. Only after the mayor and a committee made a thorough inspection and reported nothing found did the mob give up its intention of storming the sacred and beautiful edifices and reluctantly turn away. The threat to the cathedral actually came on the day following Bloody Monday, namely August 7.

The aftermath of Bloody Monday was a city in desolation. "While we write, the hot sun of this August

day is drinking the vapors from literal pools of human blood, that stagnate on our familiar streets" (*Daily Louisville Times*). Mobsmen still roamed about, gangs of boys viciously attacked foreigners and looted their homes. A looter circulated in German coffee houses, threatening the keepers that the houses would be burned down unless he received liquor and money.

The *Anzeiger* wrote: "Louisville, in the year of grace, 1855. Death and desolation is everywhere around us; the heat is debilitating; the inactivity in business, quiet as death, is depressing. When the citizen goes out, he must remember above every other business to arm himself, if he wants to get through the streets in the land of the free and the brave, in the land of the enlightened people, and save his hide."

On the following day, August 7, the remains of the victims, some charred beyond recognition, were brought by the coroner to the Court House for inquest. Among them were "a man and woman locked in each others arms—her head thrown between his breast and arm, as if to protect her face from the devouring flames. No doubt both had been shot or stabbed so that they could not get out of the way" (*Democrat*). The corpse of Francis Quinn was there, too. The *Democrat* writes: "He was a man who, for 25 years, had been a resident of Louisville—who had labored for her welfare and prosperity—who had done more to build up the lower end of the city than any other man—who was a quiet, inoffensive old man, known only to be loved and respected. But he was guilty of two unpardonable crimes; he was born in Ireland and was a Catholic—yes, three crimes—his brother was a priest."

How many lost their lives "eternity alone can reveal." In Quinn's Row alone twenty-five families occupied twelve buildings. "Some bones were found in one of the cellars, and it is generally believed that in the six or seven cellars no less than 20 or 30 were buried or burned, for the homes were full and not more than half were known to be killed or escaped" (*Democrat*).

Days after people died from wounds inflicted on Bloody Monday. One young man, the sole support of his widowed mother, was requested while on his dying bed to reveal the name of the party who shot him. He answered, "I do not want to live any longer—I know who shot me—it was one whom I believed to be my best friend—no, I don't want to live, when my friends treat me thus."

The damage done to property and business was inestimable. "The loafers of K. N. stop at nothing. They take along large sums of money, but also like to eat refreshments. Thus they looted the fruit store of a poor widow, who supported herself and her children exclusively from this trade. Wonderful stories!" (*Anzeiger*).

Property values dropped. Foreigners sold their homes and business at any price, in order to get out of the city as quickly as possible. Hundreds left for farms and towns in Indiana and for cities as Cincinnati, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and Chicago. Even prominent Americans, like ex-Mayor Speed, went to Chicago to live. Grass grew in the streets, and for a long time, whenever an

election was held, foreigners would make a trip out of the city for a day or two. It was in this crucial period that Louisville lost out in its race with other mid-western cities. Foreigners were afraid to settle there for many years. The unprejudiced citizens were conscious of the loss sustained in this respect. The *Daily Democrat* wrote August 15th:

"Take out the foreign population, and what a draft would be made on any one of them (our neighboring cities)! Ask, where were to be found in this city the most industrious and thrifty class? Who were daily purchasing lots and annually building up houses? Any one acquainted with our population would point to the Germans of the upper wards. Will they remain here after the deeds of Monday last—a terrible sequel to repeated outrages? Will any come to supply their places when they are gone? Will Kentuckians supply their places? They will not, and all know it."

Ever since the Alien and Sedition laws have been repealed, foreigners had been able to settle and allowed to improve those regions where they resided. The Know Nothings, being violently opposed to foreigners, desired the restoration of these laws. "To oppose this war (1812), to aid England in reclaiming the sailors she claimed, and at the same time to check the influx of foreigners into this country—to repeal the naturalization laws, and restore the alien and sedition laws, was the object of the Hartford Convention. Know-Nothingism virtually takes the same grounds" (*Democrat*).

Having won the election on Bloody Monday, the Know Nothings deemed it proper to hold trials and determine the guilt for the riot. It was the old story of victors sitting in judgment over the vanquished. The foreigners were condemned. The *Courier* wrote: "The parties arrested [foreigners] were the assailed instead of the assailants. What can be more infamous for the instigators of the scene of blood and arson on Monday, than to be attempting to hold the murdered victims of their damnable deeds responsible for the atrocities prompted and instigated by themselves?"

A judge asked a witness if he had seen many people at a certain place. He answered: "Not many whites, just Irish!"

Prentice drummed up a large batch of affidavits to prove the innocence of his party. However, quoting the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, a local paper said they lacked the weight of a court witness subject to cross examination. A reporter stated that he had visited a Mr. Vogt, severely wounded by Know Nothings, who confessed that he had signed under duress an affidavit in favor of his assailants.

Ladies of the city presented Prentice with a silver loving cup. For this and many letters of gratitude he was very grateful. "The cup should afford him many a happy hour," the *Anzeiger* thought, referring sarcastically to his interest in the temperance society. But the *Democrat* was not so kind. It suggested that Prentice fill the cup with the tears of widows and orphans; that he should remember them when he put the cup to his lips with his bloody hand.

Some other papers also were severe in castigating

Prentice. "That he is the author of all the murders and incendiarisms in Louisville, at the late riot, no honest man who reads his *Journal*, previous to and on the day of election, can doubt" (*The Pennsylvanian*, quoted locally). "It is not the ruffians . . . who are most guilty . . . On the heads of the influential, the wealthy, and enlightened officers, and chief men of the K. N. councils of this city, and on the now hoary head of the editor of the *Louisville Journal* forever rests the sin and the shame, and the never dying curse of Monday's memorable tragedies. It is they who have laid human life and human liberty, and the sacred rights of property unprotected at the feet of this God abandoned mob" (*Daily Louisville Times*). Other newspapers were just as sharp toward Prentice or his party, among them the *Louisville Courier*, the *Indianapolis Sentinel*, the *Cincinnati Enquirer*.

But the spirit of despair prevailed. Persecution of the foreigners continued. "Austria wants to emancipate the Jews and free Americans want to rob free Germans of their rights and make them slaves," said the *Anzeiger*. "We [of 1848] went away from Germany to find freedom; we believed we would be able to enjoy the same in the exemplary republic America. We fought against one king in Germany, and today we have to protect ourselves against thousands of conceited, stupid and misbehaved native bullies. How the gentlemen in the Fatherland will laugh! How the parsons will take advantage of these stories to prove that people are not capable of ruling themselves! But don't rejoice too soon!" Not until the Civil War did a new and fresh and wholesome spirit move into Louisville. Those foreigners and Catholics who stayed were rewarded in the end.

Today a statue of George D. Prentice can be seen facing the Louisville Public Library. Also in front of the same building, more specifically on the west front, is a statue of Lincoln. It was he who wrote to the Kentuckian, Joshua Fry Speed:

"I am not a Know Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We practically read it 'all men are created equal, except negroes.' When the Know Nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal, except negroes, and foreigners, and Catholics.'"

De Civitate Dei

(Continued from page fifty-six)

Christ, the full and final revelation of peace and divine order and justice, of divine mercy and love has been made. The law of the City of God has been established. Hence, the problem of man's nature, the problem of history, was not insoluble, if man would but take the necessary steps.

Moreover, unless we understand Augustine's treatment of the doctrine of human nature and divine grace, we will fail to achieve more than a passing appreciation

of his interpretation in the *City of God*. For these doctrines are the foundation for his entire criticism of secular undertaking, and of his continuous and persistent revaluation throughout the entire work of transitory values. Furthermore, they are the basis for Augustine's order of thought and life, for the intellectual and moral ideals embodied in that portion of divine society which "sojourns like a foreign element among infidels in this world of history or temporal process," and which he is so concerned to establish. For the relative, he substitutes the absolute, here on earth supported by faith and hope, the prelude to the absolute state of eternity, where divine justice is victorious, and where the faithful will, because of their earthly activity, achieve perfect peace and final victory.

The destiny of man and, therefore, the destiny of nations is something eternal. The substitution of a temporal city, the City of Man, would vitiate that end. The relative would be loved and desired instead of the absolute, the temporal instead of the eternal. Hence, for Augustine, the true interpretation of history can only be found in the spiritual order. History, therefore, is nothing more than man's free working out of his destiny.

Since man has been created and, therefore, is under the domination of the Creator, and since a law of his existence, reason, and love has been established, mankind is divided into two groups as men freely by their wills respect or reject this law. Augustine, therefore, made his logical division and designated each of these groups by the term, *civitas*.¹² This *civitas* for Augustine is the terminus of the operation of God's law. Those who accept that law belong to the City of God; those who reject it, belong to the City of Man. As Augustine states it:

Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self. The former, in a word, glories in itself, the latter in the Lord. For the one seeks glory from men; but the greatest glory of the other is God, the witness of conscience. The one lifts up its head in its own glory; the other says to its God, "Thou art my glory, and the lifter up of mine head." In the one, the princes and the nations it subdues are ruled by the love of ruling; in the other, the princes and subjects serve one another in love, the latter obeying, while the former take thought for all. The one delights in its own strength, represented in the persons of its rulers; the other says to its God, "I will love you, O Lord, my strength." And therefore the wise men of the one city, living according to man, have sought for profit to their own bodies or souls, or both, and those who have known God "glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise,—that is, glorying in their own wisdom, and being possessed by pride,—they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." For they were either leaders or followers of the people in adoring images, "and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever." But in the other city there is no human wisdom, but only godliness, which offers due worship to the true God, and looks for its reward in the society of the saints, of holy angels as well as holy men, "that God may be all in all."¹³

These cities are founded on the struggle which man finds within himself, but the citizens of the City of God have not on earth a lasting abode. They are but so-

¹² The connotation of this latin word, missed in our English translation, city, was the local unit of Roman administration.

¹³ *De Civitate Dei*, xiv, 28.

journalers earning the right of heavenly citizenship and eternal reign. Although man lives within the temporal city, he is not necessarily a part of it. He is not destined to remain there.¹⁴ It is only a means to be used; it is only the testing ground on which man works out the solution to his problem in the life of history: "Yet both alike either enjoy temporal good things, or are afflicted with temporal evils, but with diverse faith, diverse hope, and diverse love, until they must be separated, by the last judgment, and each must receive her own end, of which there is no end . . ."¹⁵

Before concluding, a question should be answered. Is the application of the two cities, as some have thought, to church, the City of God, and state, the City of Man? Augustine's two cities do not refer exclusively to "Church" and "State". For it is possible that many members of the church externally, by reason of their defection from the law, or their preference of self to God, belong to the City of Man; as it is possible that a state, inspired by real justice and fulfilling its obligations of peace and tranquility of order will be but the suburb of the eternal City of God.

This heavenly city, then, while its sojourns on earth, calls citizens out of all nations, and gathers together a society of pilgrims of all languages, not scrupling about diversities in the manners, laws, and institutions whereby earthly peace is secure and maintained, but recognizing that, however, various they are, they all tend to one and the same end of earthly peace.¹⁶

Hence, for Augustine, history can only be interpreted by the end of man. The life of history is the life of time which is not lasting. Individuals and nations, therefore, cannot be judged by time since it is relative. They can be estimated truly only in the light of eternity.

The individuals and nations they compose are regulated by law, but by an eternal law which, however,

they have the liberty to violate. This violation may seem successful in time, but by such they will not and cannot be judged. Nations, composed of individuals, achieve their end only in so far as they establish that internal peace, that tranquillity of order, which allows their members, for whom they exist, to attain their end. Cities and empires will pass away, but their glory or their sorrow will only be that which reflects the glory or the sorrow of their members. If the state has in its pride set itself up as eternal, an end in itself, it has vitiated the purpose for which it exists. If it has established peace and tranquillity of order, its end has been achieved.

Augustine's interpretation of history, therefore, can only mean the searching by men for a principle of integration in terms of which they can order their lives. Hence, the cleavage between those who claim to have found it in some ephemeral pride of life, whether it be a personal thing or a state, and those who by reason and faith find it in the law of Him who is Life Eternal. Citizens of both cities, however, are creatures and hence subject to the law of Him who while He decreed that they are equally free to go their several ways, still in the end, will not evade the law, but will receive that on which they set their hearts in the life of history. For in Augustine's eyes the conflicts of history are but the ultimate conflicts of our nature, the order of law or the order of pride. And if mankind does not "fall away from that unchangeable good which ought to satisfy it more than itself,"

How great shall be that felicity, which shall be tainted with no evil, which shall lack no good, and which shall afford leisure for the praises of God, who shall be all in all! . . .

There we shall rest and see, see and love, love and praise. This is what shall be in the end without end. For what other end do we propose to ourselves than to attain to the kingdom of which there is no end?¹⁷

¹⁷ *De Civitate Dei*, xxii, 30.

¹⁴ *De Civitate Dei*, xv, 1.

¹⁵ *De Civitate Dei*, xviii, 54.

¹⁶ *De Civitate Dei*, xix, 17.

Book Reviews

Julianus Pomerius: *The Contemplative Life*. Translated and annotated by Sister Mary Josephine Suelzer, C.S.P. Westminster, Maryland. The Newman Bookshop. 1947. pp. 220. \$2.50

With deep insight, R. P. Henri de Lubac, S. J., remarks:

It is not the proper duty of Christianity to form leaders—that is, builders of the temporal—although a legion of Christian leaders is infinitely desirable. Christianity must generate saints—that is, witnesses to the eternal (*The Commonweal*, January 16, 1948, p. 347).

This "proper duty of Christianity" was recognized by Pomerius, when nearly fifteen hundred years ago he brought forth his handbook of holy living. The work was intended primarily for the clergy, to guide them in informing their active life by a deeply interior life with God.

The book is divided into three sections. In the first is a discussion of the contemplative life, its distinguishing characteristics, and the means of its development. The second book deals with the active life, while the third studies the vices and virtues.

In her introduction, brief indeed, but heavily freighted with scholarly information, the translator studies the history of the text, explaining how scholars at last have arrived at unanimity in conceding the authorship to Pomerius. The writing is briefly put into its historical setting. Then, in a few packed paragraphs, the annotator sketches the evolution of the doctrine of the *Bios praktikos* and *Bios theoretikos* from Plato (via the Middle and New Academies) through Alexandrianism and Origen down to Pomerius himself in Gaul.

With regard to language and style, as the annotator indicates, Pomerius does not follow the Ciceronian tradition (partially revived by Quintilian), but rather inclines to the so-called "New Sophistic." This was a school of the second century, brought into being largely by traveling rhetoricians in the East and by the schools of rhetoric in the West. To some extent, then, one may say that the style of Pomerius approaches more the Asian style of prose than the less florid manner of Cicero.

If one bears in mind that the author was *ex professo* a rhetorician, he will have a better understanding of the difficulties confronting a translator of the *De vita contemplativa*. Besides the schools in Africa, from the earliest days of the Empire there had been academies of rhetoric at Marseilles, Lyons, Bordeaux and in other cities of Gaul. In one of these northern towns Pomerius exercised his profession.

In the early Empire, the highest stage of Roman education was the *schola rhetorica*, which devoted much attention to highly artificial writing and expression, best exemplified in the so-called *suasoriae* and *controversiae* which have come down to us from the elder Seneca. In this stage of education, all the artificial tricks of language—apostrophe, hyperbole, exclamation, in fact, all the verbal weapons of the demagogue—were worked into the mental framework of the aspiring student. And it was the rhetor who had first himself to master these artificialities of expression, in order afterwards to inculcate them upon the minds of his students. Pomerius is the last of the rhetors that we know of in Gaul.

Although the schools of rhetoric, together with their artificiality, had surely declined by this time, one is nevertheless not surprised to find traces of the florid, declamatory, even hollow oratorical style in Pomerius. The translator had to struggle with that type of writing; occasionally, at least, it is rich with a choking growth of rhetoric. All praise to her!

Undoubtedly, much of the *De vita contemplativa* is not easily rendered into readable modern English. Hence, it may seem over-critical to suggest that there are certain defects in this translation. In the first place, there is a certain hesitancy, perhaps diffidence, in departing from the Latin sentence-form and the Latin mode of casting idea-expressions; for example, in translating the so-called "jussive subjunctive," the author uses "let" or "let him" thirty-seven times in fifty-six lines (I, 8). Likewise, there is a marked inclination to translate Latin words by English words derived from the same Latin radicals. As examples, the following will suffice: we read "where perfection is to be perfected" for "*ubi perfectio perficienda est*" (I, 6, 1); again, we have "excellence," "eminence," "secure," "security" (I, 9, 2) for the corresponding Latin forms. The same penchant is discernible in the following: "detracts (from ?) no one any longer" for the Latin "*nulli jam detrahit*" (II, 21, 2).

Not infrequently, however, the translator has a crisp modern flavor in her version, as in "shock troops in battles unseen" for "*phalanges invisibilium praeliorum*." (II, 2, 1). And not a little skill is seen in her handling of the vivid rhetoric of II, 21, 2 and III, 9, 1, passages in which Pomerius the rhetor seems partially, at least, to combine the artificial striving after point of Lucan with the more natural terseness of Tacitus.

As already suggested, a reviewer should be sympathetic with and admire the courage of one who has fought the Latin of Pomerius to the last sentence.

From my remarks above I do not want it thought that the translation at hand is poorly executed. Far

from it! But, as in all human endeavors, it does, in my opinion, have certain remediable defects. I should like to note that in the back pages of this book there are a wealth of scholarly notes and a good index. If in a second edition the few defects indicated are corrected, then the fourth volume of *Ancient Christian Writers* will truly approach Pomerius' "*perfectio perficienda est*." The book is recommended to all.

St. Mary's College.

MALACHI J. DONNELLY.

The Ancestry and Life of Godfrey Bouillon, by John C. Andressohn. Bloomington, Indiana University. 1947. (Indiana University Publications, Social Science Series, No. 5.) pp. 136. \$1.50

The Indiana University Social Science Series, which was founded in 1939 for the publication of occasional papers and monographs by its faculty members and students, offers here its fifth number. The present work is a brief, concise and scholarly study of the ancestry, life and crusading achievements of Godfrey of Bouillon, who, after the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099, became its ruler with the humble title of "advocate of the Holy Sepulchre". The book is well documented and represents a commendatory work of scholarship.

If anything, the author, in trying to be objective and scholarly, has become too impersonal. Nowhere does he transmit to the reader the grandeur of the mass movement of the peoples from West to East; nowhere is there a full appreciation of the powerful impulse that influenced men to leave or sell their possessions and to travel over 1500 miles over mountains and unknown lands to redeem the Holy Land because "God Wills It". Godfrey himself emerges as a very impersonal figure, while the other leaders are merely names, occasionally appearing in the story, most often as land-grabbing, selfish individuals.

Raymond of Toulouse especially emerges as a "villain", whereas in reality he should probably be more pitied than censured. Despite all his efforts, by 1099, he alone of the great leaders was without any great principality. The author censures Raymond (p. 96) for suggesting that Jerusalem should be ignored and that the army should move on to capture Cairo and Alexandria instead. The author here notes that Count Raymond "never seemed interested in the acquisition of Jerusalem, but wanted more substantial gains". Actually, Raymond's suggestion indicates that he was a better strategist than his colleagues. Jerusalem, even after its capture, was never a strong military bastion, for it was bounded by Moslem lands on three sides. The capture of Cairo and Alexandria would have meant a strong land and sea base for the crusading state, in easy contact with the West. Later crusaders realized the strategic importance of Egypt and therefore the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Crusades had Egypt as their objective.

It may be noted also that the *Dictatus Papae* was not a decree issued by Gregory VII in 1075 (p. 17), nor was it the climactic event leading to Henry IV's excommunication. It was rather a series of statements on the ideas of the Pope concerning the papal position

and prerogatives and was published only after Gregory VII's death.

However, these criticisms are only minor and do not detract from the scholarly contribution which Prof. Andressohn has made to the historiography on the Crusades.

Saint Louis University. ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Intellectual Interests of Engelbert of Admont, by George Bingham Fowler. New York. Columbia University Press. 1947. pp. 251. \$3.00

Although Engelbert, Abbot of Admont, was one of the most prominent intellectuals of the earlier fourteenth century he is not very well known to modern students of medieval history for a variety of reasons. Since he never reduced his ideas to a synthesis in the customary *summa*, his works must be studied in published and unpublished manuscripts; furthermore, it is not yet known to what extent Engelbert borrowed or paraphrased the ideas of other scholars.

For his doctoral dissertation at Columbia University, which is here reprinted, the author chose to inquire into Engelbert's intellectual interests as a preliminary step to estimating Engelbert's place in the intellectual life of the time. As such this thesis is not an analysis but an exposition of the abbot's ideas on a variety of subjects, including theology and religion, nature, psychology, education, morality, literature, art, music, history, government and society. He wrote on separate topics as the need arose; for he was a teacher, a scholar and a learned writer who continually sought after wisdom. Since he was engaged in teaching the future political and ecclesiastical leaders of Austria, his numerous works can be divided into those which are full of pious advice for ecclesiastics and those which are replete with sophisticated advice for important lay persons. As an educator he stressed two types of life, contemplative and practical, in accordance with the future vocation of each student.

Of especial interest to an historian are Engelbert's ideas on history, government and society. "History", he says, "is the orderly narration of events as they occurred", and is most useful for princes and statesmen because from past achievements one makes reliable conjectures and assumptions. From those things that have been accomplished, Engelbert believed that the present and the future could be regulated. As a political theorist, Engelbert was an internationalist and dreamed of a world-policy which was both necessary and divine.

Dr. Fowler has accomplished a worth-while task in setting down a synthesis of the intellectual ideas of Engelbert. Although his book suffers from the universal defect of dissertations, namely, a ponderous style to the point of dryness, nevertheless it does afford a good insight into the intellectual currents in Austria in early fourteenth century, away from the more prominent centers of learning in Italy, France and England. He has made a good beginning toward his goal of estimating Engelbert's place in the intellectual life of the later Middle Ages.

Saint Louis University. ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

The Christian Churches of the East. Volume I (Revised edition), by Donald Attwater. Milwaukee. The Bruce Publishing Company. 1947. pp. xiv, 248. \$4.00

This book was first published in 1935 under the title of *The Catholic Eastern Churches*. The companion volume on the Dissident or Separated Eastern Churches is also being published in revision.

For those acquainted with Attwater's writings no special recommendation is needed for this volume. For a general introduction to the Catholic Eastern Churches, it would be surely difficult to find a better guide. Although the book is a popular work, an *oeuvre de vulgarisation*, it is nevertheless soundly founded on facts.

The amount of space, a single chapter, devoted to the past of the Eastern Churches is relatively small. But the author is primarily concerned with those Churches as they function today, especially in their liturgy. He discusses adequately the various branches of the Byzantine, Alexandrian, Antiochene, Armenian, and Chaldean Rites. A final chapter deals with Eastern Monasticism. An appendix, general bibliography, glossary, and index round off a truly useful book which can be gladly recommended to all who wish to become better acquainted with our fellow-Catholics of the East.

St. Mary's College.

MALACHI J. DONNELLY.

Bordeaux and the Gironde 1789-1794, by Richard Munthe Brace. Ithaca, New York. Cornell University Press. 1947. pp. xi, 279. \$3.00

No subject in European history has been as much written about as the French Revolution. *Pro* and *con* schools have numbered hundreds of scholars who have devoted their lifetimes to research on the subject and to publishing thousands of books on the Revolution. Till recently these scholars have concentrated on the Parisian scene, studying first the activity of the national government, then that of the city government, then that of the people in the Parisian wards. It is now recognized that the full picture of the French Revolution can be painted only when a large number of studies are made of what went on in provincial towns throughout France in revolutionary days.

Such a contribution is made by Professor Brace's study of Bordeaux and the Gironde. This is an excellent study, made from archive material, on the little things that were the French Revolution to the people of Bordeaux: forming and disciplining the National Guard, meeting the wheat shortage, raising volunteers for the national army, electing representatives to the national assemblies. It is the story of factional struggle within the city as well as provincial opposition to Parisian domination of France.

This scholarly work does not alter the general picture of the French Revolution in any startling fashion. Its chief value, perhaps, is in showing that the Gironde was not unanimously behind the so-called Girondin party or opposed to the Montagnards. Although the work is objectively done, the general tone indicates the author's sympathy for the Jacobin party in Paris rather

than for the less determined, less capable Girdondins. But such sympathy does not cause the author to betray himself as a good scholar, unless one questions why only five pages out of 242 of text should be devoted to the Terror in Bordeaux.

(May the reviewer use this occasion to protest against meaningless paraphernalia of scholarship? Professor Brace frequently tells us to consult manuscript material at Bordeaux. For example: "*Ibid.* See Section II, Articles XII-XIV." It is sufficient for him to indicate the source of his information without suggesting we go to Bordeaux ourselves.)

Saint Louis University.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

American Attitudes Toward the Rise of Napoleon III, by Henry W. Casper, S. J. Washington. The Catholic University of America Press. 1947. pp. xv, 242.

The revolutions of 1848 throughout Europe were looked upon by most Americans as the realization in the Old World of those democratic, republican institutions which the New World had so successfully introduced in the preceding century. It was therefore natural for these same Americans to look with misgivings and regret on the repression of these revolutionary movements in 1848 and 1849. It was also natural for them to watch France in particular; for Americans felt they had closer ties with France than with any other European country.

A close study of American attitudes toward the rise of Napoleon III can prove valuable for two reasons: (1) it must give a relatively thorough analysis of political and constitutional developments in France during these four years; (2) it will reveal the extent to which Americans of the time were aware of extra-American developments and competent to pass judgment on them. Father Casper's work is a good, competently worked out and well presented study that does accomplish these two tasks.

The work is of particular value in showing the reaction of the two U. S. ministers, Rush and Rives, to the steps in Napoleon III's rise. Its title is, in fact, misleading, for while the title suggests that this is a study in American public opinion, the work turns out to be a study in diplomatic history. Occasionally advertence is made to newspaper opinion and to the comment of prominent American statesmen and men of letters on Napoleon's rise, but these occasions are few—and no newspaper west of Philadelphia is consulted. This does not detract from the value of this study; it only suggests that the title is misleading, that it obscures the fact that this is an excellent study of the reaction of our two ministers in France to the trying events of French history from 1848 until 1852.

Saint Louis University.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

History in the "Encyclopédie," by Nelly Noémie Schargo. New York. Columbia University Press. 1947. pp. 251. \$3.00

The purpose of this thoroughly documented work is "to view all the aspects of history as they present themselves in the *Encyclopédie*". In it the author studies the method of history, types of history, and the role of

history as found in the encyclopedists' writings. Under these headings she has compiled everything to be found in the *Encyclopédie*, showing the reader both what the contributors said about history and how they used the historical approach on the subjects they wrote about.

The reader of this study is forced to conclude with the author that the encyclopedists were not nearly so lacking in historical sense as has been commonly believed. By digging through the *Encyclopédie* mine, so often explored for other ores, the author produces abundant evidence that the encyclopedists did possess the modern historian's critical sense and that they often applied it to the various subjects about which they wrote.

The work is disappointing in one respect. D'Alembert wrote to Voltaire that "time will distinguish what we have thought from what we have said." The author of this study, unfortunately, does not. She is aware of the problem, of course, but she shelves it as not coming within the province of her study. Thus she avoids showing the purpose of history and of the historical approach to theological and philosophical subjects, as used by the encyclopedists. They used the historical method principally as an instrument of destruction, not because they saw any inherent value in it—which makes it impossible to conclude with the author that "they tried to free history from prejudice and narrow preoccupations."

Except for this one important point, which throws the whole study out of focus, it is a valuable contribution to the group of recent studies on the *Encyclopédie* as the best mirror of the eighteenth century.

Saint Louis University.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

Forced Labor in Soviet Russia, by David J. Dallin and Boris I. Nicolaevsky. New Haven. Yale University Press. 1947. pp. xv, 331. \$3.75

Three years ago, as our press and our public officials vied in paying tribute to our "democratic" ally, Soviet Russia, this book would have been most unwelcome to a great majority of Americans. But even while hopes were so unilaterally high for a future of peaceful cooperation, at least twelve million human beings, men, women and children, were being worked to death in slave-labor camps by a deliberate policy of bloodless liquidation. In the present book, David Dallin (co-author Nicolaevsky contributed only one chapter to the book) has collected eye-witness narratives, official documents and newspaper accounts to present an almost unbelievable picture of conditions in the camps. Although the information concerning the camps is necessarily sketchy, the volume is as thoroughly documented as it could be by a person living outside Russia.

The book is divided into two parts. The first section, dealing with the situation as it exists at present, contains accounts and descriptions of the most important labor camps, of conditions of life and of the terrific toll of life. Especially vivid is the account of the Kolyma region in the coldest wastes of the Arctic, "the land of the white death" into which millions of slaves were sent to extract gold from the frozen soil. As a

result of their death-dealing labor, Russia now mines about fifty per cent of the world output, but the author points out (p. 146):

The cost of this gold has been very high. On the basis of the figures given above it appears that every metric ton of Kolyma gold cost the lives of 700 to 1000 human beings. One human life for every kilogram of gold—such is the price on the slave market in Magadan.

The second section traces the origin and growth of the forced labor system in Soviet Russia. Originally established to replace the Tsarist prisons which were considered to be remnants of capitalist civilization, the labor camps were early combined with the concentration camps established by the CHEKA for the punishment of opponents of the state. With the introduction of the Five-Year Plans by which Russia was to be converted over-night into an industrial state without foreign investments, a great extension of the slave labor system followed. In slave labor the Soviet government found a great, mobile mass of men who could be worked for long hours with almost no expense to the government. They became, and still are, the government's most profitable labor for they build electric power dams, factories, canals, railroads, and mine coal, iron and gold.

Until 1939 the slave camps had a steady influx of men "politically unreliable". Then the outbreak of war in 1939, large portions of populations from Soviet-occupied countries were forcibly moved eastward. Cessation of hostilities in 1945, instead of decreasing the number of new recruits, rather increased it, for now Russian prisoners of war and civilians forcibly taken to Germany were herded behind barbed wire, charged with aiding the enemy. Russian soldiers have no business being captured, and surrender is considered tantamount to treason.

It seems inconceivable that in our time slavery should still be so widespread, that a state which covers one-sixth of the earth's surface should rest on a foundation of forced labor in which a segment of mankind is degraded to the level of beasts of burden. Inconceivable it may be, but here we have documentation that such is the case.

Saint Louis University. ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Lewis and Clark, Partners in Discovery, by John Bakeless. New York. William Morrow and Co. pp. viii, 498. \$5.00

Of the thousands of printed works concerning the Lewis and Clark expedition, this new effort seems to have some outstanding advantages. The author has discovered some new, but not particularly vital, material. Further, he has done a careful synthesis of everything which had been offered before his own work was published. No one will question the scholarly nature of the book. This reviewer can attest that Mr. Bakeless strove to leave no source unexamined before he put his manuscript into the hands of his publishers. Hence, the study is, it seems, an important contribution to the Lewis and Clark literature. The book has an excellent bibliographical section by way of collected notes for each chapter.

Before the book appeared your reviewer objected to calling this work a biography. Both the publisher's

dust cover and the preface of the book call this a biography of Lewis and Clark. By stretching a point, it might be a biography of Lewis. But it is by no means anything near a biography of William Clark, who as yet has no biographer. Clark is a far more important figure than the moody, difficult Lewis. Clark's work for the West only began with the Expedition. That work continued for the remaining years of a long life. It is not, therefore, unjust to object to considering the present, otherwise good, work a "biography" of the two central figures. It might be here noted that a biography of William Clark should have long since been written.

It is the opinion of the reviewer that this book, in style, is not up to previous works of the author. Sometimes the reader finds it flat and even dull. The author seems to become lost in the details of the diaries. There are a few sections which are not in too good taste. One recalls that Lewis and Clark had the courtesy to record raw scenes in a classical tongue. The present author might well have followed their example.

There appear no outstanding errors of fact in the book. The author tells a clear and historically correct story of the important journey of the Corps of Discovery from its ideological stage until the return of the group. The account is good history.

Saint Louis University. JOSEPH P. DONNELLY.

The Grassland of North America: Prolegomena to Its History, by James C. Malin. Privately printed. 1947. pp. vi, 398. \$3.00

Since the days of early exploration and subsequent pioneer settlement the grasslands of North America, i.e., the Great Plains and the Intermontane Plateau regions, have been the unwholesome subject of many forest-conscious folk whose descriptive vagaries and numerous misinterpretations have led many well-meaning Americans to consider anything west of the Eastern Forest Belt and to the Rockies, and thence west of the Rockies to the Cascades, as desert lands—areas to be avoided in the development of any economically sound type of human occupation.

Malin, long a resident within the heart of the grasslands of the Central Plains of the United States, in his excellent, scholarly, and timely book, "The Grasslands of North America," makes a complete and comprehensive study of the grassland regions and does much to set the misled outsider aright.

In Part One; the Sciences and Regionalism, his plant, animal, and insect ecological treatment is sound. In the plant-animal relations and biotic equilibrium he makes specific mention of and gives specific instances in considering the factor of altitudinal zoning.

The climate he treats as unpredictable, and implies that the weather is too variable from year to year to use the term "climatic cycle" in reference to any reliable so-called rhythm of rainfall and drought.

Of special interest is the author's reference to the contribution of leading geographers of the 1920's who were "groping about trying to determine the scope of a rejuvenated subject," and likewise to American

human geographers who were projecting into the field of social theory, drawing conclusions "beyond the facts."

The treatment of the subjects of grass formations and soils is especially noteworthy. In these chapters the author quotes other writers, and accepts or rejects their findings with adequate explanation in either case.

In dealing with the grassland and early exploration excerpts from many explorers are quoted to show the fallacy in reasoning and description of a forest folk who spoke of the land as "desert and barren, covered only with grass, and an occasional clump of trees." To the author the "deficiency was in the mind of the forestman explorer, and not in the grassland." The plains Indian, he states, had made a satisfactory adjustment to this grassland environment, and even the introduction of the horse as a means of travel for the Indian was of sufficient significance to effect the whole biological equilibrium, for this "new type of mobility revolutionized the Indian's culture."

As to climatic relations (wind and water) to soil and to the grassland equilibrium in general, the author takes issue with modern conservationists who picture the grasslands as a "virgin land" with a "nearly perfect biotic balance, and removal of soil no faster than soil was formed in nature," . . . "water in the rivers was clear" . . . "floods were caused by careless farming which had caused the loss of the topsoil." To substantiate his claims the author refers to Clear Creek as mentioned by explorers in 1849, as an exception to the rule among streams which were not clear, because eroded soil had been deposited within their channels. He also mentions the great flood in the Missouri valley of 1844, before the days of careless farming; that the hoofs of the buffalo loosened and caused widespread wind-blowing of the topsoil. Of special interest is his just condemnation of the recent "educational" film, "The Plow that Broke the Plains." Malin clearly states that "if man found himself unable to cope with these several kinds of environment (as found within the grasslands) it was man and not nature in that region that was deficient."

To people who migrated westward the grasslands were at first a barrier, but through the introduction of adequate and new farm machinery, windmills, and transportation facilities the more humid portions of the grasslands were devoted to agriculture—corn and other humid-land crops at first; then wheat and dry-land grains as the pioneers moved farther westward into the less humid regions. The most recent agricultural phase (and a noteworthy one) is that of a more diversified program with a growing emphasis upon livestock. In making this adjustment, most of the credit is given to the farmers themselves, not through trial-and-error, but through several decades of practical experience.

According to statistics collected, the owner-tenant farmer, who owns some land and leases more during times of prosperity and relinquishes it in times of economic stress, is the best all-around type of farmer, for the return from rented lands helps to pay for his investment in machinery and relinquishment of the lease becomes an economic "safety valve" in times of low prices.

The chapter on the Open System is well treated. Ancient Greece and Rome held the closed system concept, within the Mediterranean Basin. European geopoliticians between the two world wars of the present century held similar concepts.

The bibliography is well chosen and more than adequate. All in all, the treatment of the grasslands, past and present, is sound, and is the excellent literary product of a writer who "knows" the grasslands of North America.

Saint Louis University.

JOHN W. CONOYER.

From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes, by John Hope Franklin. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1947. pp. xv, 622, xlii. \$3.75 text edition, \$5.00 trade edition.

In this work, Dr. Franklin has attempted the difficult task of collecting the facts of Negro history from African beginnings down to 1947, in so far as those facts are connected with the Negro in the United States. That the task is not a complete success is not surprising; that it is as successful as it is, is cause for congratulation.

Certain problems are immediately obvious to the author and reviewer of a book of this scope. First, the task of crowding the desired information into the compass of a normal-sized book is virtually impossible. On this score, the author has done well, although it has meant a great amount of condensation in the early chapters. Secondly, with as many bits of detailed information as are available in the panorama of American Negro history, an integration of these bits into a homogeneous, easily-flowing narrative is not easy. Nor, in the case of this volume, has it been done consistently. It has a slight tendency to appear like a patch-work in which the individual pieces obscure the over-all design. Thirdly, the problem of incorporation of general history as a necessary background for the field of specialization soon appears in any work on a specialized topic. It is impossible to say how much background is "necessary", but this reviewer feels that a satisfactory amount has been included to set the backdrop before which the main figures—the American Negroes—perform.

The plan of this volume is essentially chronological, from the African background through the slave-trade and the history of slavery in the United States into the period of freedom. Approximately one-half of the book is devoted to the era before 1865; the remainder covers the days of freedom. There is, in the first half, little of the unusual; the facts and interpretations presented are not at great variance with those of other historians of the period.

The latter portion of the volume presents another problem. Dr. Franklin is a Negro writing about Negroes. This task, in view of the strained relations which have existed between whites and Negroes in various areas at various times, makes impartiality difficult. Dr. Franklin has not achieved complete impartiality. He has, without doubt, adequately documented his material; it is not inaccurate or false. However, the selection

of material, which was obviously necessary, tends to stress the injustices done to Negroes and the individual accomplishments of members of the race. In view, however, of the extent to which this could have been done without straining accuracy, Dr. Franklin's restraint is laudable.

In spite of the foregoing criticisms of "From Slavery to Freedom", it must not be felt that this is an inferior book. It is a generally well-written, well-organized volume, in which there is evidence of real scholarship and interest in the subject. It constitutes a valuable addition to a field of history hitherto not too well explored in an objective manner.

Dr. Franklin is a graduate of Fisk University with his master's and doctor's degrees from Harvard University. In 1945 he was awarded a research grant by the Social Science Research Council. His is now Professor of History at Howard University.

Source material cited in the bibliographical notes is largely secondary, with primary sources not listed. The purpose here is to give the interested reader a list of the most easily available material. The professional historian might wish for a listing of primary sources as well.

The physical appearance of the volume is attractive and free from errors. Illustrations, although few, are good and well chosen.

Saint Louis University. JASPER W. CROSS, JR.

Prosperity Decade, from War to Depression: 1917 to 1929, by George Soule. Vol. VIII, "The Economic History of the United States." New York. Rinehart and Co., Inc. 1947. pp. xv, 365, tables, illus., index. \$4.00.

This is the second publication of the projected nine volumes of the Rinehart "Economic History of the United States." Here George Soule accomplishes admirably the purposes of the editors to treat the main lines of economic development in a book for the lay reader which is based upon the vast number of statistical reports and specialized monographs now available.

The treatment begins with an account of the United States fumbling its way to the organization and control required by the conditions of modern war. Control is credited with minimizing the inflationary tendency of war-time economy, and the unbecoming haste with which control was abandoned upon the return of peace receives its due share of the blame for the bewildering developments which followed in its wake. The post-war boom, the short-lived depression, recovery, expansion, recession, prosperity, boom and bust are recounted and analyzed in turn. Mr. Soule's knowledge of prevailing economic theories is utilized in placing the factors involved in each in clear relationship. In addition to chapters dealing with the economy as a whole, special attention is given to particular industries, both those which shared the fruits of prosperity and those which did not. The plight of labor and that of the farmer receive full and dispassionate treatment. There is a chapter, "International Tides," which delineates the world-wide impact of our war-fostered change from a debtor to a creditor nation while our production kept

the world short of dollars until the entry of American money into the foreign investment market. Early symptoms of the approaching catastrophe are indicated: the inflexibility of the price level in certain sectors of the economy, and the unnecessarily wide margin of profit in manufacture, utilities and railroads; these contributed to the speculative trend. The unhealthy character of banking practices and the contribution of business itself to the frenzy by its entry into the call-money market are recounted by the author who makes his conclusion quite clear: "While it is now possible to identify certain major infections that were developing, there seems to be no simple inoculation, the injection of which into the economic body would have maintained its health." (p. 335.)

Mr. Soule's use of illustrative statistics gives further clarity to his lucid narration of the forces at work in the 'twenties, and a series of judiciously chosen and interpreted tables runs through the text. A concluding chapter critically surveys the economic literature of the period. *Prosperity Decade* well maintains the high level set by the first volume of the series, Fred A. Shannon's *The Farmer's Last Frontier*.

Saint Louis University. R. W. McCLUGGAGE.

James Monroe, by W. P. Cresson, Chapel Hill. University of North Carolina Press. 1946. pp. xiv, 577. \$5.00

The measurement of historical personages according to their writings is accepted as the traditional method. The late William Penn Cresson applied this technique as far as possible. "As far as possible" was not very far in the case of James Monroe because of the relative sparsity of that president's writing on certain subjects. Indeed, Doctor Cresson compared such a task to an attempt to reconstruct prehistoric creatures from their fossilized footprints. Cresson necessarily had to use supplementary sources, then, in preparing *James Monroe*. If this is approaching the subject by indirection—entering Monroe's estate by the rear gate, so to speak—such approach must be justified as virtually the only one open. That more Monroeviana were not available could hardly be blamed on Penn Cresson. Rather, he rendered a needed service in utilizing the existing Monroe sources and coupling that matter with related materials to present a living, "non-fossilized" James Monroe.

Too often have biographical historians lost sight of Monroe in the shadows of his senior Revolutionary fellows (Washington and Jefferson) or else buried him in the pages of his 1823 message, now styled the Monroe Doctrine. It would not be strange had W. P. Cresson fallen into that second ditch, since he previously wrote a *European Background of the Monroe Doctrine* and held various diplomatic posts himself. Such, however, is not the case. He has given adequate treatment to Monroe's activity in the Revolution, the Continental Congress, the Senate, the Virginia governor's office and the general events of his presidency—besides a competent treatment of Monroe's diplomatic assignments and his now famous doctrine. That Cresson thus painted a full-length portrait, not a mere profile, proves his

special merit. Fortunately, Cresson supplied a need (a modern, well-balanced single volume work on Monroe) before his death—something which the present writer believes has not been done even in the fifteen years between Cresson's demise and the book's eventual appearance under the editorial direction of M. A. DeWolfe Howe. (The latter also supplied the introduction to the work.) The *Monroe* volume remains congruous despite the former's premature death, and is generally an acceptable and very interesting piece of historical biography.

Saint Louis University. CLIFFORD J. REUTTER.

Latin America: An Historical Survey, by John Francis Bannon, S. J., and Peter Masten Dunne, S. J. Milwaukee. The Bruce Publishing Company. 1947. pp. x, 944. \$6.50

Scholars unanimously hold that historical events are valuable and significant because they enable us to find both the necessary antecedents of present-day conditions, and the best immediate source of experience for the future. Over and over again, in the course of history, it has been obvious that failure to understand other peoples with "new customs, new philosophies, new standards of value", etc., is due to the fact that their past historical heritage has been neglected or overlooked. This mistake has led not only to indifference toward our fellow men, but also to false conceptions of race superiority, to international conflicts and wars. Fathers Bannon and Dunne are aware of this dangerous problem as far as Latin America is concerned, and have observed that many aspects of the history of our neighboring countries, "have escaped due notice and interpretation".

Bearing in mind this basic idea, that we must know the past in order to understand the present and be able to lay a solid foundation for the future, the authors have made a successful effort to present a comprehensive study of the historical background of the "Other Americas" from their colonial time up to the present day. They modestly claim that their work "may be just another added to the growing list of survey histories on the subject", but the truth is completely different, if we want to be fair to them.

At the very beginning of their book, Fathers Bannon and Dunne state that the key to the Latin American problem, so baffling to many norteamericano, "lies in the distinctly Catholic foundation upon which its civilization rests, a whole mass of beliefs, attitudes, standards, with which there is little basis for comparison in Anglo America. Hence, it may not be futile for two North American padres to attempt to interpret that background, using their religious brotherhood with the Latin not as a reason for apologetics, but as a light to illumine dark corners and to uncover hitherto and, perhaps, unsuspected passageways".

The two North American padres have been able to show their readers that south of U. S. A. there are "twenty fellow republics, distinct in their individuality and proudly so, yet cemented together by the cohesive force of a culture different from our own—full, warm, rich, fascinating". It is certainly encouraging to find that in the middle of so much unjust criticism about

Latin America as well as material and business interests for possible resources south of the border, these two authors have compiled this piece of research not for pecuniary purposes, but just to show that our buenos vecinos "need no longer to be courted, and much less patronized, to the same degree which characterized inter-American policies of the late thirties and half-way through the forties".

Fathers Bannon and Dunne have contributed to the strengthening of inter-American relations not only a textbook full of excellent information, clear and concise expositions, useful chronological tables, and well selected lists of supplementary readings, all intended to "render the study more helpful to student and professor", but also an accurate, friendly and unbiased interpretation of Latin American culture and civilization.

The limits of a brief review do not allow us to dwell at length on the thirty-seven chapters into which the book is divided, but any further comment can be abbreviated by saying that both the material and its presentation are a sympathetic panorama, decidedly intended to promote a better acquaintance of the Americas, a real and permanent friendship, and a mutual respect and understanding of the peoples of the North and South. The general attitude of the authors is in the spirit of those unforgettable lines of the Liberator and first Apostle of Pan-Americanism, "es necesario ser amable para ser amado", which should be the guiding principle in our continental relations.

Saint Louis University. HOMERO CASTILLO-SILVA.

Book Notices

A Biographical Sketch of St. Ann's Parish, Toledo, Ohio, by Frederick A. Houck. Printed privately. pp. 118. \$1.00

When the full history of the Catholic Church in the United States is written little volumes such as the present will be both indispensable and invaluable to the scholar who produces such a work. The present volume is both a history and a living cross-section of the parish it describes.

Books Received

A Catholic Quiz Book, by Herbert A. Kenny and Geoffrey P. Keane. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1947. pp. 204. \$2.00
Pere Lagrange and the Scriptures, translated by Richard T. Murphy, O.P. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1946. pp. 216. \$3.75
The Redemption of Israel, by John Friedman. New York. Sheed & Ward. 1947. pp. 139. \$2.00
The Priest and a World Vision, by James Keller. New York. The Christophers. 1946. pp. 103. \$1.00
The Psalms, a new translation by Ronald Knox. New York. Sheed & Ward. 1947. pp. 239. \$2.00

CORRECTION: In reviewing *The Apostolic Fathers*, a volume of *The Fathers of the Church* series, in the November (1947) number of the BULLETIN, page 21, the reviewer made the statement that the series *Ancient Christian Writers* is "being published by The Catholic University of America." This is incorrect. The latter series is not published by that university, though its editors are of the staff of that institution.